

THE
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

APRIL, 1876.

ART. I.—*Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History.*—No. V.

[THE following elaborate sketch by the Rev. Richard Beard, D.D., Professor of Theology in Cumberland University, has been prepared in compliance with earnest personal and written requests from the editor of the present series of articles upon Cumberland Presbyterian history. Dr. Beard is the only man living who could prepare such a sketch. As one of the pioneer institutions of learning in the Great Valley, the narrative of the origin, success, difficulties, and failure of Cumberland College, will always be read with deep interest and instruction by the student of American educational history. As the historical parent of Cumberland University, and indeed, of all our denominational colleges, its history has peculiar claims upon the careful study of all intelligent members of our communion.

The professors and alumni of old Cumberland College may well be congratulated upon having found so faithful a record drawn up by a hand so impartial and so loving. Very few wealthy and living colleges have presented to the public so minute and graphic a memorial as that which is here furnished by the venerated ex-President of a poor and extinct institution.

Be it noted, however, that Tennessee, which was specially the field cultivated by the agents of Cumberland College, has

VOL. VII. NO. II.—1

now become the seat of great Church institutions of learning in a pre-eminent degree.

Be it also noted, that the graduates and pupils of Cumberland College have become *leaders* in pushing forward to a successful issue the other educational work of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Perhaps it is not out of the range of strict history to say, respecting this seat of learning so long and pertinaciously maintained at Princeton, Kentucky: "*Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice!*"

From Pennsylvania to and through Texas, Cumberland Presbyterians have done a great pioneer work as educators. I hope, through such collaborators as Doctors Beard, Miller, Mitchell, and others, to preserve worthy memorials of that work.

J. B. L.]

BRIEF HISTORICAL SKETCH OF CUMBERLAND COLLEGE, AT PRINCETON,
KENTUCKY. 1825-1861.

In the course of the sessions of the old Cumberland Synod, held at Princeton, Kentucky, in October of 1825, the subject of the establishment of a literary institution, to be under the control and patronage of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, was first brought before that body. The Church was then fifteen and a half years old. Four years before this time, Mr. Franceway R. Cossitt, a young minister of the Episcopal Church, who had emigrated from New England, and established himself as a teacher a few miles from Clarksville, in Middle Tennessee, had been introduced to Rev. Thomas Calhoun, and Messrs. Robert Baker, Robert S. Donnell, and the writer, at a Camp-meeting on Wells' Creek, about twenty miles from Clarksville. Mr. Cossitt, after a further acquaintance, determined to identify himself with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. He was accordingly received, and in a short time set apart to the whole work of the ministry in this Church. He continued, however, the avocation of teaching, and by correspondence with some of the leading ministers previous to the meeting of the Synod in 1825, had prepared their minds for action upon the measure which was proposed, as it has been said, in the course of its sessions. The subject had also been brought before the

minds of some gentlemen of influence, who were not members of the Church, but who were its friends, and who were deeply interested in the cause of education in the country. Several of these men attended the meeting of the Synod, and united, by invitation, with the members in the discussion of the question of establishing a Cumberland Presbyterian high school or college. Two of the most prominent of these, were Messrs. John Gray, and Ephraim M. Ewing, both prominent lawyers, the former from Elkton, and the latter from Russellville, Kentucky.

The leading members of the Synod who participated in the discussion, were Finis Ewing, Samuel King, Robert Donnell, F. R. Cossitt, David Lowry, and John and William Barnett. These were the most prominent men in the Synod, and at that time, in the Church.

It was finally determined to establish a manual labor school, to be called the Cumberland Presbyterian College, at some point conveniently central to the denomination. Four leading considerations were urged by those who were prominent in the measure: a system of education adapted to the sons of the yeomanry of the country, to young men who were not too fastidious, and who had energy enough to unite labor with study; cheapness; the securing of health in the midst of intellectual pursuits, and the education of young men for the ministry in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

The writer recollects very distinctly that the argument for health in connection with education, was particularly urged by Mr. Cossitt, and Mr. Ephraim M. Ewing. They were both frail men, and appealed to their own loss of health in scholastic pursuits, in confirmation of their arguments. All who participated in the discussion, urged the argument for the education of the young ministry. It will thus be perceived that this argument, which has been so often repeated, and urged among us recently, is not new. It is fifty years old. We are thankful for what it has effected, but it ought to have accomplished a great deal more. This is, however, by the way.

It was understood that Southwestern Kentucky was a central region to the Church, and that the contemplated college

was to be located somewhere in that section of country. Consequently a commission was appointed from that portion of the Church, as agents of the Synod, to select a suitable site for the institution, and to take such steps as would be necessary to its organization, and to its being put into operation as early as possible. This commission held its first meeting, it is supposed, from its date, previous to the adjournment of the Synod. The following is the record of this first meeting:

"The Synod of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at its last meeting, held at Princeton, Kentucky, on the 21st day of October, 1825, having entered into a resolution, and adopted a constitution for the establishment of a college in some situation within its bounds, and having proceeded to appoint Rev. John Barnett, Rev. F. R. Cossitt, E. M. Ewing, Esq., J. D. Hamilton, Esq., and Joseph M. Street, commissioners, to determine upon the proper location of said college, and for other purposes, and the said commissioners having met on the 24th day of October, 1825, appointed to meet again at Princeton, Kentucky, on the first Monday in January, 1826, to proceed to the performance of the duties assigned to them by the Synod, and adjourned."

Again: "In compliance with the order of Synod, and their own agreement, Rev. John Barnett, Rev. F. R. Cossitt, E. M. Ewing, Esq., Joseph D. Hamilton, Esq., and Joseph M. Street, met at the house of Mr. Mitchusan, in the town of Princeton, Kentucky, on the first Monday in January, 1826, it being the second day of the month, when Rev. John Barnett was called to the chair, and Joseph M. Street was appointed Secretary."

A resolution was adopted, and is referred to, but seems to have been mislaid. It is not found in the record. The commission adjourned to the next day. The next day, January 3rd, they met and spent some time in examining the surroundings of Princeton. This was one of the points in the minds of the Synod for a location of the new institution. From Princeton they adjourned to Hopkinsville; and then to Elkhorn; and finally to Russellville, examining the neighborhood of each place for a suitable site; and also endeavoring to ascertain the amounts which might be expected in the way of

subscriptions or donations, from each town and vicinity, in the event of the location of the college in their midst.

Finally, on the 13th of January, 1826, after examining all the ground which seems to have been before them, together with the prospects of assistance from the several points, the commission determined in favor of Princeton, and for the immediate location, the farm of Mr. Mercer Wadlington, situated about a mile from the town. It was a valuable farm, containing between four and five hundred acres, with good improvements, and an unfailing spring of good water. They agreed to pay six thousand dollars for the property, and were to have possession the first day of March following.

It was further ordered by the commission, that the trustees to be appointed afterwards, should have power to purchase seventy-three acres of land additional, which was situated in suitable relations to the farm already purchased, the whole constituting one of the best farms in the county. At the same meeting it was "further ordered that the Rev. F. R. Cossitt be, and is hereby, chosen teacher of said institution, and that he be allowed at the rate of one thousand dollars in commonwealth paper per annum for his services, to be paid semi-annually, in advance, from the time of his entering into the institution. That the Rev. John Barnett be appointed manager of the farm and boarding establishment. That the Rev. John Barnett, Rev. David Lowry, John H. Phelps, Asbury Harpending, and John Mercer, Esq., be, and they are hereby, appointed a committee to act as a Board of Trustees, and that all the aforesaid appointments continue until the next meeting of the Synod; and, furthermore, that the said trustees take into their possession the subscriptions and donations, receive titles for the lands donated in the name of the trustees for the use of said college; collect the funds as they may become due, and do all acts and things that they may deem necessary to bring the said institution into full and complete operation." Signed by "John Barnett, Franceway R. Cossitt, Joseph M. Street, E. M. Ewing, Joseph D. Hamilton."

The commission had thus completed its work, and surrendered its authority to its successors under another name. Of

the first meeting of the new Board of Trustees, the following is the record:

"At a meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian College, at the farm of Mercer Wadlington, near Princeton, January 20th, 1826, present, Rev. John Barnett, Rev. David Lowry, Asbury Harpending, John Mercer, and John H. Phelps. Rev. John Barnett was chosen Chairman, and John H. Phelps, Clerk."

At this meeting the purchase of Mr. Wadlington's farm was effected, for the sum of six thousand dollars in specie. Fifteen hundred dollars were to be paid in advance, and the balance in equal portions, at the expiration of one and two years. In this transaction we see the beginning of the pecuniary troubles from which Cumberland College was never wholly free up to the time of its final abandonment by the General Assembly, in 1844. We shall reach this dark chapter in its history in due time. The trustees bought a large farm at a high price, and were under the necessity of borrowing money for the first payment. Yet the purchase seemed to be necessary. It was to be a manual labor school, and the labor of the young men was expected to contribute largely towards their boarding, and in order to their laboring productively, it was necessary to have something to work upon, and something to work with. Not only a farm was needed, but suitable utensils and stock for carrying forward its operations.

Another fact is to be brought out in this connection, which is very material to the history. Money and property were subscribed in Princeton and the neighborhood, as a condition of the location of the college near the town. When the writer first became acquainted with these matters, it was accustomed to be said that about fifteen thousand dollars had thus been subscribed or pledged in that way. Some of the subscriptions and pledges were in property, but the value of the whole was estimated at about the sum mentioned. Of course the trustees expected a reasonable portion of this sum to be realized. It turned out, however, that very little was ever realized, and when the time came for the second pay-

ment upon their obligation to Mr. Wadlington, they were under the necessity of borrowing the money as before. When the final payment became due, they had still to borrow.

Of course no reflections are intended here upon the memory of those whose delinquency in paying their subscriptions and making their promised donations, originated the necessity of these heavy debts on the part of the trustees. The writer does not know, and never knew, who those persons were, but states what were admitted facts, and facts spoken of freely forty-five years ago. It is perhaps out of place, but the temptation can hardly be resisted, to mention that our continued experience in the management of our public enterprises, has been very much of the same kind up to the present day. We become aroused and plan great things; we promise liberally; but when the hour of trial comes, a few bear the burden, whilst others stand off and do nothing, or rather often become faultfinders, and hindrances, to those who are trying to fulfill their high obligations. There are men among us who expect to carry the smart of such financial folly and wickedness to their graves.

It has been stated that Mr. Cossitt had been appointed "Teacher" of the institution, and there is no record of the fact, but there is a tradition, that he commenced his labors on the first day of March, 1826. The order was that all the students should board at a common boarding-house, occupying rooms at a convenient distance from both the college building and the refectory. Six neat brick rooms were erected for the accommodation of students, each large enough for four young men. The rest of the rooms were of similar dimensions, but cabins with puncheon floors, clapboard roofs, and chimneys constructed of wood and mortar, the fire-places having backs of stone. A large building of hewed logs, two stories high, with stone chimneys, and wide, country-like fire-places, was erected for college purposes. It was literally a log college, and perhaps the second in America which could be so denominated, Mr. William Tennent's, of New Jersey, being the first. What had been the family residence of Mr. Wadlington, with some additions, served as a board-

ing-house. The rate of board and tuition was fixed at sixty dollars per year, of ten months and a half. Each student was required to labor two hours per day, at whatever kind of labor the manager of the farm might prescribe. The labor was expected, however, to be mostly confined to the farm. It has been stated that Rev. John Barnett was to superintend the farm and boarding-house. He was permitted to bring to the institution such parts of his own property as would be useful to the farm and boarding-house, and for the use of such property, and for his personal services, he was to have "a reasonable compensation."

At a meeting of the Trustees of the College on the 27th of March, 1826, the following order was passed :

"That the faculty direct what kind of diet is thought to be wholesome and frugal, according to the custom of other colleges, and that they shall give any other directions which they may think proper in relation to the boarding, lodging, and cooking establishments."

At a meeting of the trustees on the 24th of April, 1826, two matters of graver interest occurred. Mr. Asbury Harpending, who had been previously appointed Treasurer of the Board, resigned, but being re-nominated, and unanimously elected again, he resumed the duties of the office; the condition, however, being that he was to give "bond, with good security, to be approved by the trustees, in the penalty of twenty thousand dollars, for the faithful discharge of his duties, and made payable to the trustees."

It appears that he fulfilled the condition. The other matter was graver still. It is thus recorded :

"Resolved, Unanimously, by this Board, that they will encumber by mortgage, the lands conveyed to the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian College by Mercer Wadlington and his wife, to the securities in the bonds given by the trustees of said institution to said Wadlington, for the purchase money of said lands."

This is a very distinct intimation of distress already felt by the authorities of the college, on score of debt, and yet this is but the second month of the existence of the institution.

The following is a good resolution adopted at a meeting of the Board, June 28, 1826:

Resolved, That in employing a teacher, or assistant teacher, in the said college, due regard shall always be paid to qualification, and unless candidates for office produce a diploma, they must undergo an examination on the branches they profess to teach, by the faculty of the college, in the presence of the trustees."

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees, September 18, 1826, Mr. Daniel L. Morrison, was employed as an assistant teacher in the college "at the sum of five hundred and fifty dollars per annum, payable in commonwealth's paper, semi-annually, in advance, he having been examined agreeably to the order of the trustees."

In the midst of their other labors the Board of Trustees were making efforts to collect what was due to them, and under date of January 2, 1827, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That Rev. David Lowry be requested to address each individual that stands in arrears to the institution, either verbally or by letter, as may best suit his convenience, requesting them each one to make payment of what they owe the institution, but *in a mild and persuasive manner.*"

This resolution is supposed to relate chiefly to subscriptions which had been made, and the donations promised as an inducement to the location of the college. If so, it soon became certain, that notwithstanding the *suaviter in modo* enjoined upon their agent, they would not realize much. Unfortunately men are frequently careless of such debts, and persuasions do not effect much.

It will have been observed, that the college up to this point in our narrative, has been denominated the Cumberland Presbyterian College. This was the name designated by the Synod in the resolution, in conformity with which the institution was established. It was the name preferred by the leading members of the Church, and a committee was appointed, of which Rev. Henry F. Delany was a leading member, to visit Frankfort at some time while the approaching Legislature was in session, and superintend the procuring of a charter. Mr. Delany attended the meeting of the Legisla-

ture, and conferred with prominent members, who advised him to drop the *Presbyterian* from the style of the college, and ask for a charter of *Cumberland College*. The apprehension was, that if the term *Presbyterian* was retained, it would stir up sectarian jealousy, and perhaps defeat the object altogether. He yielded to these counsels, and the bill was accordingly presented and passed, for a charter of Cumberland College. These statements are made, not from the record, but from memory. They are, however, unquestionably in conformity with the facts. Consequently our narrative henceforth will be a narrative of facts connected with the operations of "Cumberland College." The last record of a meeting of the trustees of the *Cumberland Presbyterian College*, is dated January 2, 1827. The first meeting of the trustees of *Cumberland College* was held May 28, 1827. The members present were David Lowry, Henry F. Delany, A. Harpending, John H. Phelps, and Will Lander. David Lowry was elected President of the Board, Will Lander, Secretary, and A. Harpending, Treasurer.

This change in the name of the college created some dissatisfaction. Kentucky politics were a good deal unsettled at that time, and a few strenuous members of the Church outside of the State, thought that the surrender in this case was but a beginning of what would be likely to follow in the way of rendering the operations of the college unstable. Still it is believed that the State never refused any subsequent change in the charter, that was thought necessary to the prosperity of the institution by its friends.

At a meeting of the trustees, May 30, 1829, it was

"Resolved, That the Faculty be instructed to make known, that a teacher of French would be employed, to give instruction from the commencement of the next session of Cumberland College."

We shall see that in the course of a few months such an appointment was made. In the meantime another movement was made towards collecting the old subscriptions, which have been already mentioned. At a meeting of the Board of Trustees, on the 29th of December, 1829, it was

"Resolved, That Will Lander be, and he is hereby, appointed

a commissioner to collect the subscriptions to the Cumberland College, within Caldwell and the adjacent counties; that the said commissioner be, and he is hereby, authorized to close the same by note, or notes with a credit of six or twelve months, and upon the failure or refusal of the subscribers to adjust their subscriptions within a resonable time, according to the terms of the subscription, that then, and in that event, the said commissioner be required to collect the same by due course of law."

The trustees were evidently in earnest in the passage of this resolution, but it was understood about the time that it was unavailing. There is no account in the record of any assistance from the old subscriptions.

At the same meeting of the Board, two other resolutions were passed, which deserve attention. The one related to the conduct of the students:

"*Resolved*, That no student shall in future be permitted to purchase any article from any slave, or free negro, without the consent of some member of the faculty; and, resolved, that if any student shall violate this resolution, he, or they, so offending, shall be subject to such correction as the faculty shall deem expedient; and that a copy of this resolution be placed in the dining-room of the refectory, and also in one of the rooms of the college."

The other resolution relates to the appointment of an instructor in French, according to a previous announcement. Mr. Bertrand Guerin was appointed, after examination, to teach French, Latin, English Grammar, and Geography, at a salary of four hundred dollars per annum, and his board in the refectory. Mr. Guerin was a foreigner, and soon proved to be a literary vagabond. His conduct became so objectionable, that he was called before a committee of the General Assembly in May following. The committee were very severe upon him, and the result was, that he was made to understand that his resignation would be very agreeable to all concerned. Of course he soon left the institution.

At the same meeting, December 29, 1826, Mr. Cossitt was re-employed as teacher, or rather as President, of the college, for the following year, at a salary of eight hundred and

thirty-three dollars and thirty-three and a third cents. Mr. Morrison was also employed at a salary of six hundred dollars; "said Morrison was also to act as Corresponding Secretary and Clerk of the Faculty, without any additional compensation."

At a meeting of the Board, January 27, 1830, Rev. David Lowry was appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy in the college. The fixing of the salary was referred to the General Assembly. He was permitted to have a family residence and kitchen erected, near what was called the camp-ground spring, at a cost of not more than fifty dollars to the college; he was to have, in addition, the use of ten acres of land, and his firewood. Fifty dollars would of course build a small house and kitchen. Still it was a day of small things. The President of the College lived in a house that could hardly be considered better than a cabin. The little house at the back of the farm, near the camp-ground, was, for a few months in 1830, a pleasant home, as the writer very well recollects. It was unpretending as the residence of a Professor of Moral Philosophy, but no complaints were made. It was a feature in conformity with the general features of the college.

From the establishment of the college, it had been customary for the Board of Trustees, in conformity with the recommendation of the Synod, to appoint agents, or, as they are generally termed in the records, missionaries, to solicit donations for the benefit of the college. In the fall of 1826, Rev. Reuben Burrow, and Rev. A. G. Gibson, were appointed to that service. They traveled entirely through East Tennessee and North Carolina, but collected very little. Mr. Burrow says the sum was small. It seems to have fallen considerably short of paying their expenses.

In the fall of 1827, Rev. Laban Jones was appointed to a similar service, and at the expiration of twelve months, paid over to the Treasurer of the college, one hundred and forty-three dollars and twenty-five cents, as the result of a year's labor. It is significant, too, that his commission extended to the *United States*.

At a meeting of the Board, November 21, 1829, Revs. John

W. Ogden, and M. H. Bone, who had been engaged in a similar agency, reported after paying expenses and commission, seventy-eight dollars and forty-seven cents. Taking these as specimens, we would judge that but little was realized from agencies. Revs. Hiram McDaniel, John L. Dillard, and William Bigham, were subsequently appointed agents or missionaries, but the results of their labors are not recorded.

We have now reached the stage in our narrative at which the writer became connected with Cumberland College. His own personal recollections will assist him, whilst he will still be guided in the accounts of all important transactions by the records. Early in the month of May, 1830, he reached the institution, and united with it as a student. This step was taken after having been nine years and a half in the ministry, and four and a half of those years engaged in teaching. Of course nothing like a ripple was produced on the surface of the society of the college by that event, but it was an important one to him. Mr. Cossitt, Mr. Morrison—we called him Judge Morrison then—and Mr. Guerin, were the college teachers. Mr. F.C. Usher, and a young Mr. Dodds, from Indiana, were preparatory teachers. Mr. John McGrew managed the boarding-house, and Mr. Rainer Mercer, a licensed preacher, the farm. There were about one hundred and twenty-five students. The college seemed a good deal like a bee-hive. Each teacher was ringing the bell every hour for his class; and every two hours the horn was blowing for the laboring divisions. All seemed to be interest and animation. It must be confessed, however, that a portion of the animation, and a portion by no means inconsiderable, as time showed, was expended in mischief: but still there was life. In addition to all, the faculty, dressed in their long black gowns, presented rather an imposing appearance to a frontier circuit-rider and common school teacher. The black gowns, however, it is believed, did not outlive that collegiate year.

In a few days the general Assembly met at Princeton. The meeting was opened by a sermon from Rev. Finis Ewing. It was the last Assembly that he ever attended. The Assembly made two recommendations to the Board of Trustees, vitally affecting the interests of the college. One was,

that the rate of board and tuition should be raised from sixty to eighty dollars per annum; the other, that Mr. Lowry disconnecting himself from the college, should assume the entire control of the *Religious and Literary Intelligencer*, the publication of which had been commenced a few months before, and that Mr. Cossitt should direct his entire time and attention to the college. They had previously conducted the paper jointly, whilst both held important positions in the college. The first recommendation was adopted, and also the second, the parties concerned acquiescing.

In 1830 there were several young men in the college preparing for the ministry. Among them were Silas N. Davis, who was understood to be preparing for ordination, Cyrus Haynes, Elim McCord, John D. Perryman, and John S. Napier. The two last named turned their attention from the ministry; the others became prominent and useful in the work, but have all passed away. The graduating class of that year consisted of two members, Cornelius G. McPherson, and James P. Barnett. Mr. Barnett died early. Mr. McPherson has been chiefly engaged in the work of education, as a Professor in Cumberland College; then in Cumberland University; President of a college in Missouri, and President of a female college in Memphis. For a time, too, he was assistant editor of the old *Cumberland Presbyterian*, at Nashville. He still lives, and is now Rev. C. G. McPherson, of Louisville, Kentucky. At the close of our collegiate year, in September, Judge Morrison terminated his connection with the college. He was evidently a respectable scholar, and an estimable old gentleman. He taught, perhaps, to some extent after that, but lived chiefly in retirement.

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees, October 29, 1830, Mr. T. C. Anderson was appointed Tutor. The following is the record:

"On motion of R. A. Patterson, resolved, that Thos. C. Anderson, be, and he is hereby, appointed tutor in Cumberland College, for the term of one year, commencing on the first Monday in November next, and that he receive for his services the sum of five hundred dollars payable semi-annually, and that he also act as librarian for said college, and that he

be allowed to board and have his washing done at the refectory free of cost, he having been examined according to the by-laws."

It may be mentioned here that Mr. Anderson was re-appointed at the commencement of the next year, and thus gave two years of service to the college. Owing perhaps to the change in the price of board and tuition, as recommended by the General Assembly, the number of students was not so large as it had been; and for a year and a half two teachers were considered sufficient. Dr. Anderson has been prominently connected with the operations of the Church for forty-five years, and needs no additional notice here.

In May, 1831, the General Assembly met again at Princeton. As it had been usual for some years, the condition of the college came in for a large share of its attention. The financial embarrassments of the institution had become so great, as to present a prospect almost hopeless. A single encouraging fact, however, is too far out of the ordinary line of events in those days to be left unnoticed here. Rev. John W. Ogden reported and paid over to the Treasurer seven hundred dollars collected by him as agent for the college. Similar reports from a sufficient number of agents would have afforded permanent relief. But this was a single case. A proposition had been made in the Board, upon a mortgage of the college property, to try to secure a loan of three thousand dollars to pay some of the debts of the institution. Again, at the same meeting of the Board, on the 2nd day of April, a proposition was made by Revs. Hiram McDaniel, John Barnett, and F. R. Cossitt, to "donate each of them one hundred dollars, provided forty-seven others would unite with them in like sums, in sufficient time to afford relief from the pressing exigencies of the institution. These three persons were at once appointed agents, to carry this proposition into effect if possible. In the midst of this condition of things, the time arrived for the meeting of the Assembly.

The proposition of Messrs. Cossitt, Barnett, and McDaniel, it will be remembered, was made on the 2nd day of April, and they had been appointed a committee to carry it into ef-

fect if possible. We hear nothing more of the proposition or the committee. On the 17th day of May the Assembly met. It is supposed that nothing had been done. In the progress of the sessions of the Assembly, a proposition was made, to recommend to the trustees of the college, the leasing of the college-farm and boarding-house, and all the property connected with the institution, to Rev. John Barnett, and Rev. Aaron Shelby, for a term of years, upon such conditions as could be agreed upon by those parties. It was thought that the financial affairs of the institution, in the hands of vigorous and practical men, personally interested in them, might be so managed as to yield an income sufficient, in a few years, to pay its debts, and give it a new impulse in its work. The proposition was favorably received by the Assembly, and they so recommended.

For the satisfaction of readers in relation to important events which occurred forty-five years ago in connection with the operations of the Church, the report of the Assembly's Committee, appointed to make arrangements for Cumberland College, is herein embodied. The Committee consisted of Revs. William Harris, Robert Donnell, F. R. Cossitt, and Reuben Burrow; and Messrs. James McReynolds, John Vining, and William S. Waterson. There were no better men in the Assembly or in the Church. The following is their report, which was adopted:

"Your Committee have conferred with the Rev. Messrs. John Barnett, and Aaron Shelby, and have received the following proposals:

On condition that the members of the Assembly will give their notes to the amount of two thousand four hundred dollars, payable one-half next May, and the other half in May 1833, the said Barnett and Shelby will assume the payment of all the debts of the college of whatever kind or character existing at this date. Provided furthermore:

1. That the net profits of the printing office belong to the said Barnett and Shelby, for the term of four years from this date, together with the profits of the past year.
2. That after the current expenses of Cumberland College

are paid, the net profits arising from tuition, as they may be ascertained, belong to said Barnett and Shelby, for the four years next ensuing.

3. That all moneys now on hands not otherwise appropriated, either in the treasury or in the hands of individuals, together with all subscriptions, bonds, deeds, except the deed for the college farm, notes, accounts, &c., be given to the said Barnett and Shelby.

4. That the two brick-kilns belonging to Cumberland College, be transferred to said Barnett and Shelby.

5. That all moneys now or hereafter collected by Rev. John W. Ogden, and not otherwise appropriated, belong to said Barnett and Shelby, and that some one missionary be employed to make collections for four years.

Your committee recommend that the contract be entered into, provided that the said Barnett and Shelby, on their part, and the trustees on theirs, will comply with the following conditions:

1. That the General Assembly, under this contract, have the paramount control of Cumberland College, as heretofore.

2. That the trustees have power to appoint all officers, and make contracts for the regulation of the literary, farming, and boarding departments, as heretofore; and to transact all other business which they are empowered to transact by the charter of the college, not interfering with this contract."

On the 24th of May, 1831, this contract was consummated by Messrs. Barnett and Shelby, and the Board of Trustees as the agents of the Assembly. This is not the place for inquiry, but the writer's impression has always been, that but little was ever received from the members of the Assembly, or from the printing office. These men were practical and energetic ministers of the gospel, it is true, nevertheless very well versed in managing matters of business. It was hoped, therefore, that under what was expected to be their vigorous financial administration, public confidence would be restored, and the probabilities of the success of the institution greatly increased.

Messrs. Cossitt and Anderson continued as the only teachers to the spring of 1832. In September of 1831 there were

four graduates: Thos. B. Reynolds, R. S. Dulin, R. B. Castleman, and Amos Andrews. Mr. Reynolds was a very promising young preacher. He went South and died early. Dulin studied law, entered the practice, went to Mississippi, and also died early. R. B. Castleman studied law, settled in Nashville, represented his county once, in early life, in the legislature, but turned his attention to business, and has amassed a good property. He still lives. Andrews went West, and it is supposed died early.

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees, April 30, 1832, Livingston Lindsay, after due examination, was appointed Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, for the space of one year, at a salary of five hundred and fifty dollars. This was considered an important addition to the Faculty. Mr. Lindsay had received his principal education at the University of Virginia. He brought a fine reputation with him to the college, and maintained it well to 1838, when he resigned his professorship, and entered upon the practice of law. Some years ago he removed to Texas, and settled at La Grange. It is understood that he occupies now a high legal position in that State.

The graduates of the year ending in September, were C. W. Ridgeley, of Baltimore, Maryland, W. G. Estill, of Winchester, Tennessee, Wm. H. Barnett, of Kentucky, and the writer of this article. Of this class C. W. Ridgeley was a native of Maryland. He returned and settled in Baltimore, as a lawyer, and became quite eminent. He perhaps still lives. W. H. Barnett, of Kentucky, studied medicine, and spent some years in Missouri in the practice of his profession. He returned to Kentucky, and settled a few miles from Princeton, where he died a few years ago. Young Mr. Estill is supposed to have studied law in Winchester, his native place. He went to Alabama in early life. An old catalogue of the college reports him as a lawyer. Mr. Anderson has been noticed elsewhere. Of the remaining member of this class, the writer, of course, says nothing.

Mr. Anderson, who closed his connection with the college as an instructor, with the close of the year, received the honorary degree of Bachelor of Arts. The day after the Com-

mencement, the writer was appointed Professor of Languages in the institution, at a salary of five hundred dollars per annum, and his board and washing.

On the 25th of June, 1832, the following preamble and resolution were adopted by the Board of Trustees, intended to take effect at the opening of the collegiate year, in November:

"WHEREAS, The General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, held in May last, in Nashville, adopted a resolution recommending to the trustees of Cumberland College, to pass some ordinance, more effectually to preserve economy among the students, whilst members of said institution; therefore, on motion of J. H. Rackerby,

Resolved, That in future the students and faculty of said college be, and they are hereby advised to wear as their weekly apparel during winter, good strong woolen jeans, or cassinet; and for summer, flax linen, or hemp linen, or some other article of domestic manufacture, so as to secure the object contemplated by the General Assembly; also that each student be requested to furnish himself with a large and strong linen apron, which may be used when at work, so as to preserve his other clothes."

This would be a good recommendation to some of our faculties and college students now, omitting of course the counsel in relation to the *aprons*, as under our present system of operations they are not needed.

In the following November, the new Professor of Languages, as *in duty bound*, commenced his administration in a very common blue jeans coat. From a mistake of the tailor, in cutting, it was nearly large enough for two men of his size, but still he wore it, and found it very comfortable. His recollection of the outfit of the other members of the faculty is not so distinct, but of his own it is very distinct.

At the close of this year, 1833, we sent forth what was considered a large and respectable class. Cyrus Haynes, Wm. A. Scott, Richard Henry Ball, Lawrence N. Waddill, G. W. Smith, A. S. Mitchell, and Jesse Franklin Ford, were the graduates. Cyrus Haynes and J. F. Ford became respectable and beloved ministers, and are both dead. Waddill, Smith, and Mitchell

entered upon the practice of law; the two former are dead. Richard Henry Ball entered the ministry of the Protestant Methodist Church, and also acquired distinction as a teacher. Wm. A. Scott became the present Rev. Dr. Scott, of San Francisco, California.

In the fall of 1832, early in November, the cholera first made its appearance in Princeton. Some little alarm was produced in the college community, but no case occurred in it. The students and faculty remained together. No suspension of the daily routine of exercises was found necessary.

On the 19th of April, 1833, the trustees entered into an agreement with Messrs. Barnett and Shelby for the erection of a new college building. It was to be of brick, sixty-five feet in length, and thirty-nine in width, and two stories high, with passages above and below, crossing each other in such a way as to furnish eight blocks of rooms of suitable dimensions for dormitories. In what was called the garret story, lighted by dormar windows, were to be the chapel and two library rooms. The building was finished in due time. No recitation, or lecture *rooms proper*, were provided. The great object was to provide comfortable lodgings for the students as well as rooms to study. Some of the better dormitories were used by the instructors in hearing their classes, and the chapel was used for lectures and religious services. The accommodations were very imperfect, but they were far in advance, in both neatness and comfort, of those furnished by the original *log* building, and the *cabin row*. The exterior of the building presented very much the appearance of a Pennsylvania barn, but still we were able to bear any reproach from that source, as we were plainly going up rather than down. In consideration of this building, these brethren were to have the control of the finances an additional twelve years, making, with the five years already allowed them, seventeen years.

Sometime in the autumn of this year, 1833, Mr. Shelby sold his interest in the college to Mr. Harvey Young. Mr. Young was a most estimable man, and at once took charge of the farm and refectory, to the management of which both he and his family were well adapted. It was considered

a great accession, especially to the boarding house. Mrs. Young was long remembered there.

About the 1st of July, 1834, the cholera made its appearance a second time in Princeton. It was far more violent and fatal in its form and effects than it had been at its first appearance. Still it did not reach the college. It seemed a wonder, but still it was so. In a short time, however, the fever in a malignant form began to develop itself in the college community. A number of the students were attacked. Mr. Young became sick and died. The writer and his wife sick in different rooms in the boarding-house, and were not able to see each other for several weeks. All the students whose friends lived at a convenient distance, went home. It proved to be a loss of nearly an entire session. But one of the students, however, who remained at the college, died. Mr. Barnett, who lived in the neighborhood, lost his oldest son, a young man of fine promise, whose death has been mentioned in the notice of the class of 1830. The visitation was a severe blow upon the college. Mr. Barnett, who, as we shall find, failed to carry out his purpose and that of the trustees and the Assembly, in his appointment as manager of the fiscal affairs of the institution, always attributed his failure, in great part, to this providential dispensation. It was a heavy trial. The number of students was greater than it had been at any time since the raising of the price of board and tuition from sixty to eighty dollars. Besides, as we have seen, the income from almost an entire session was lost, whilst the expenses of the establishment were not diminished in equal proportion. An impression, too, began to be made on the public mind unfavorable to the healthfulness of the locality.

There were two graduates at the close of this year: Pleasant M. Griffin, of Winchester, Tennessee, and John A. Hanson, of Georgia. Young Griffin was educated for the ministry by the congregation of Winchester. He was a young man of fine promise, scholarly, amiable, and eloquent. His poverty urged him to the South. He settled in Franklin, Louisiana, and died in the course of his first year

there. Hanson returned to his native Georgia, and we only know that he grew into respectability and usefulness.

Mr. Young had died in the course of the year, and the trustees by an agreement between themselves and Mr. Barnett became a party with him in the management of the financial affairs of the college, and what had been the firm of Barnett and Shelby, and then of Barnett and Young, now became the firm of Barnett and the Board of Trustees.

There were several changes made along in these years in the time of holding the college Commencement. At first September was the time. It was then changed to the corresponding time in December, with a view to saving the firewood on the farm, a great deal of which was consumed in the winter months. By this change the vacation occurred in midwinter. The students however, were dissatisfied, and another change was made, and a specified day in July was settled upon as Commencement-day. The change, however, was not to take effect until after the Commencement of 1835, which was still to take place in December. In this year we had three graduates: J. H. Whetstone, T. J. Houghton, and W. J. Houghton. Whetstone married early and settled in Ohio as farmer. T. J. Houghton studied law, and W. J. Houghton, medicine. Both settled in Alabama and died early.

The next commencement occurred in July, 1836. At this Commencement a large and promising class graduated. The members were J. R. Denton, J. S. Roane, J. C. Kirkpatrick, G. W. Usher, W. E. Barnett, J. W. Taylor, and J. M. Taylor, and D. R. Harris (honorary). Young Denton was an ordained preacher, and a young man of great promise. In his graduation, the valedictory address was assigned to him, which was the only badge of distinction given in the college. He was unwell, but delivered the address with unusual tenderness and solemnity. He wept freely in the delivery, and the assembly wept with him. It seemed afterwards a sort of foreshadowing of what was to come. At the close he went to his room, and to his bed; he suffered ten days or two weeks, and closed his promising life. It was felt to be a great infi-

tion. He was educated at the expense of Rev. Robert Donnell, whom he always claimed as his beloved and honored foster-father. John S. Roane studied law, settled in Arkansas, acquired reputation in the Mexican war, became governer of his State, and died in the prime of life. Dr. J. C. Kirkpatrick still lives a respected citizen in his native State. G. W. Usher died early. William E. Barnett and Joseph W. Taylor still live, the former in Tennessee and the latter in Alabama. Mr. Taylor has acquired reputation both as a lawyer and a man of letters. Mr. Barnett studied law, but has directed his attention chiefly to business pursuits. James M. Taylor became a prominent physician in Louisiana.

A remark certainly deserves a place here which was often repeated forty years ago by those of us who were most closely connected with the events. Thomas B. Reynolds, Pleasant M. Griffin, and John R. Denton, were all young men of the first order of promise; had all just entered the ministry; were all educated to the completion of their course, as our course of education was then established; and all died within the space of five years, when the college was struggling for life, and the Church that educated them seemed to be in the greatest need of just such men. We sometimes thought that such providences were dark shadows upon our educational path. God, however, works in his own way, and sometimes there is a cloud over it. If Cumberland Presbyterians have been destined, in his providence, for an educating people, he has certainly given some of them a severe preparatory training. Still he is right even if he occasionally, in his righteousness, administers the rod. We believe this and are quiet. Let him reign, because in his hands all is safe. After this little episode let us return to our narrative.

The combined administration of Barnett and the trustees continued to 1837. The General Assembly met at Princeton, in May of that year. Those who felt the deepest interest in the affairs of the college, had become satisfied that a change of policy was necessary. The reverses growing out of the sickly season, and perhaps other causes, had produced great and general discouragement. The Assembly recommended the formation of a joint stock association, for the purpose of

carrying foward the operations of the institution, and paying its debts. These debts were occasionally changing hands, but still existed, and were pressing upon it like an incubus. It was hardly ever out of sight of the sheriff's hammer. Some new measure was necessary, and the one suggested appeared most likely to be successful. Mr. Barnett yielded to what seemed to be the exigencies of the case. An association was at once formed, and at a meeting of the Board of Trustees, held May 29, 1837, the following preamble and resolution were adopted:

“ WHEREAS, The General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at their late sessions in Princeton, in May, 1837, passed a resolution requiring the Board of Trustees of Cumberland College to transfer and convey all the college property, both real and personal, to an association of individuals thereafter to be formed, upon the condition that said association, when formed, shall assume and pay all debts and demands against said college not exceeding, however, the sum of twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000); and, whereas, said association has since been formed, and have stipulated the fulfilment of their part of the engagement required by the said General Assembly; therefore, on motion of P. B. McGoodwin,

Resolved, That the President of the Board, in his corporate capacity, be directed to execute and sign the necessary instrument or covenant by which all the property of said college, whether real or personal, which they hold as trustees, may be ~~fa-~~ly and effectually transferred and conveyed to the association aforesaid.”

It will be observed that the meeting of the Board of Trustees, at which the preamble and resolution here recorded were adopted, was held on the 29th of May. According to the records of the association, the first meeting had been held on the 25th of May, four days preceding, and a regular organization had been effected on the 26th, three days anterior to the meeting of the Board. We have now a new order of things; Barnett and the Board of Trustees are superseded by the Cumberland College Association, or rather by the President and Directory of Cumberland College Association.

The following is the preamble of the Constitution of the Association, setting forth its objects:

“WHEREAS, The Cumberland College has become involved in debt, and is in danger of failing to accomplish the benevolent objects of its establishment, for the want of pecuniary aid; and,

WHEREAS, The General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has proposed to transfer and convey all its right, title, and interest in, and to, all the property both real and personal, belonging to, or in any wise connected with said college, and has directed its transfer to be made by the trustees of the college, to an association of individuals, if one could be formed, which would assume all the pecuniary liabilities of the college; and,

WHEREAS, Such an association has been formed according to the proposition of said General Assembly;

Now the undersigned believing the college to be of great public benefit, and of vital importance to the community, in which it is located, to the world, and to the Church, have agreed, and do hereby agree, to form themselves into an association for the purpose of sustaining it, and perpetuating its advantages and blessings. And the more effectually to secure these ends, we do adopt and subscribe to the following constitution for the government of the Association.”

The Constitution consisted of seventeen articles. The second article sets forth that “The stock shall be divided into shares of two hundred dollars each, and the subscription may be extended to any amount not prohibited by the charter of incorporation, and any person may become a member by subscribing one share.”

The third article sets forth the object of the association: “The advancement, patronage, and promotion of the prosperity of the college.”

The fourteenth article is the following: “The nomination of the trustees of the college shall belong to the Association.” These nominations formerly belonged to the General Assembly.

The following is the fifteenth article: “The first object of the Association shall be the liquidation and settlement of the

existing debts against the institution, and afterwards the funds of the Association may be appropriated to any other useful purpose, by order of the Association, when a majority of all the members concur."

There were thirty-four subscribers representing thirty-two shares, to this constitution. Twenty shares were represented by shareholders themselves, and twelve by proxy. These latter shares had been taken by members of the Assembly and visitors who had left for home before the organization was completed. The members represented by proxy were Joel Lambert, Thomas Lambert, C. P. Reed, James Smith, Wm. L. Martin, T. C. Anderson, Thos. B. Wilson, J. C. Wear, John W. Ogden, F. C. Usher, Joseph Brown, and James Orr. The other members may be supposed to have been influenced partly, at least, by personal and local considerations; but it is a pleasure to record that we have always had men willing to give unselfishly for the Church and for humanity. The proxy members were scattered over the Church, and had no personal or local interest in the institution. Whatever the others may have been, *their* contributions were unselfish. Of the remaining twenty shares, but three of them had been taken by members of our own Church; the seventeen were held by members of other Churches, and even of the world. These particular facts are due to the truth of history. The college had friends abroad in the land, and in its own immediate vicinity. It had friends who were not members of our own Church. New life was given to the operations of the institution, and new hopes were inspired in the hearts of its friends.

The graduates of this year were J. G. Biddle, Stephen F. Hale, and B. G. Dudley. Mr. Biddle was already a licensed preacher, and devoted his life to the ministry and to the work of instruction. He was an estimable man, and died in Winchester, Tennessee, in April, 1857. Stephen F. Hale, from an unpromising beginning, became a distinguished lawyer and politician in Alabama, took an active part in the great struggle between the North and the South, was for a while a member of the Confederate Congress, and finally lost his life at the head of a Southern regiment, in one of the battles in Vir-

ginia. No nobler man on either side fell a victim to that unhappy conflict. Benjamin G. Dudley studied law and entered the practice; represented his county once or twice in the Legislature of Kentucky, but died young.

The graduates of 1838 were Robert D. Ray, and Thomas Johnson Phelps. Mr. Ray settled in the practice of law in Missouri. He became respectable in his profession, and, it is supposed, still lives. Young Mr. Phelps emigrated to California at an early time in the opening of that country. The graduating class was small, and the friends of the college, and especially of the new order of things, conceived the idea of a sort of literary festival, to give additional eclat to the occasion, and to the administration of the new dynasty which had been introduced the year before. A fine table was spread, ladies and gentlemen were present in large numbers. Mr. R. C. Ewing, who had just completed his junior year, and who has become the present Hon. R. C. Ewing, of Trinity University, delivered an address as the representative of the faculty and students, and the Hon. W. P. Fowler a response in behalf of Cumberland College Association. Every thing seemed to indicate promise and confidence. It was an imposing occasion, and a beautiful one of the kind.

In the course of the vacation which followed, the writer received a call to a professorship in Sharon College, Mississippi, which he accepted. Rev. F. C. Usher was appointed Professor of Languages in his stead. Mr. Usher was one of the early graduates of the institution. He had also spent three years, and graduated at Princeton Theological Seminary, in New Jersey. His connection with the institution continued to 1846, when he was called to the Principalship of what afterwards became Bethel College, at McLemoresville, West Tennessee. The understanding has been that he was not happy in his work there. His health failed, and in the year 1850 he left Tennessee, and returned to his native neighborhood in Kentucky, soon to die, as it turned out, among the friends of his youth. He was an amiable and good man, and deserved more at the hands of the Church than he ever received.

At the same time Mr. Lindsay severed his connection with

the institution, and entered upon the practice of law in Princeton. Mr. Lindsay was succeeded, after an interregnum of some time, by Rev. Mr. Payne, an Episcopal minister of the town. Mr. Payne was, in a great measure, a stranger in the community when he settled there, and altogether a stranger to the Church with which the college was connected. His connection with the institution continued a year, or a year and a half. In the course of that time the spirits of the Association had begun to flag. They grew discouraged, and it is apparent from the record, that the subject of transferring the institution to some other Christian denomination, with a view to a better patronage, was under consideration. Public rumor said that the transfer, if made, was to be made to the Episcopalians. How far Mr. Payne was responsible for such a direction of the minds of the association or others, it is not proposed to consider here. He, however, became very objectionable to the friends of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. It was very natural that he should have thought of making capital for his denomination from the state of things around him; but still he may not have done so. Let the matter rest.

It has been stated that the association were becoming discouraged. In 1837 they undertook their work. The report to the General Assembly of 1838 was encouraging. The next Assembly met in 1840. By that time discouragements had become very great. Preparatory to that Assembly a resolution was passed to be presented to that body, earnestly appealing to them "for aid and assistance to the college." In their report to the General Assembly, the association state distinctly that they had considered the question of transferring the college to some other Christian denomination, expressing at the same time their preference of the foster care of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, as the founder of the institution, could that care be rendered more effective. Dr. Cossitt and Mr. Usher made a vigorous appeal to the Church in a well written pamphlet, which was published and widely circulated previous to the meeting of the Assembly. This body met in May, at Elkton, Kentucky. The Church had certainly been aroused to some extent, and

the members of the Assembly seemed disposed to do something worthy of themselves and their constituents. They appeared to feel that a crisis was upon them. "A magnificent scheme was formed. If it had been carried into effective operation, it would have relieved the college from debt, and rendered it permanent, if not prosperous. It was proposed to raise one hundred thousand dollars for educational purposes. Fifty-five thousand dollars of that sum was to serve as a perpetual endowment of Cumberland College; thirty thousand was to be used in Pennsylvania, in the endowment of a college there; and the remaining fifteen thousand dollars was to constitute a sort of floating capital to be used as circumstances might suggest. Several of the most popular young men in the Church were engaged as agents; the people were not illiberal in their subscriptions, and everything seemed to promise well. Dr. Cossitt confidently believed that the college would be endowed, and that the most liberal provision would be made for the education of the ministry. This last was always a controlling thought with him, as it has been with all the earnest educators in our Church. This thought originated the impulse which led to the establishment of Cumberland College at first, and afterwards to the establishment of Cumberland University."

Some time after the General Assembly in 1840, Rev. Cornelius G. McPherson was appointed Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, in the college. A brief notice of Mr. McPherson's life has been already given. He continued in the professorship until the revulsion, which will be noticed in its place, and became the first professor in his department at the organization of the institution at Lebanon. His connection with the college at Lebanon continued until the latter part of 1844, when he resigned.

Delegates had been appointed by the association to the General Assembly. On the occasion of their report to the association on their return, a difficulty presented itself. When the Assembly in 1837 surrendered the college to the association, it became, by the conditions of the surrender, and by a change of the charter, in fact, the property of the Association. The Assembly required in 1840, as a condition pre-

cedent to their endowing the institution with fifty-five thousand dollars, that the charter should be re-changed, so as to transfer the right in the property to the Church. The difficulty was an awkward one. The association were unwilling to give up the college until the endowment was raised, and they were thereby assured of its probable success; and the friends of the Assembly hesitated in their efforts towards the endowment, whilst the right of property and control still remained in the association. The first formal development of this difficulty occurred at a meeting of the association, December 4, 1840. On the 14th of December the parties came to an understanding. The particulars need not be mentioned.

A report was made to the Assembly of 1841, and Dr. Cossitt, who had represented the association in the Assembly, made an encouraging and conciliatory report on his return. In the course of the year, however, from May, 1841, to May, 1842, the pecuniary difficulties of the college became so serious, that steps were taken towards selling the principal portion of the college-farm, and such other property as could be spared, with a view to liquidating its debts. This was the condition of things when the Assembly met in 1842. The institution was found to be deeply involved, its property under the sheriff's hammer; considerable sums had been subscribed as a part of the endowment of the fifty-five thousand dollars contemplated, but very little, if anything, had been realized. The result was, the Assembly resolved to remove the college to what they considered a more promising location, and a commission was appointed to make a selection, and authorized also to select a new Board of Trustees.

In the meantime the friends of the institution at Princeton, resolved to make vigorous efforts to disencumber it, as far as possible. All the land was sold except ten acres. Perhaps some other property was sold at the same time, as there were such stock and utensils as are used on a farm. The ten acres reserved, included the college buildings, the spring, and the old log college, which had been converted into a sort of boarding-house. With the college also the apparatus and library were saved, and the friends of the institution determined to try to revive and carry it forward. They took the

ground, too, in the controversy which grew up out of the action of the General Assembly, that however an institution of learning, located and chartered in Kentucky, might be abandoned by its patrons and former friends, it could not be removed. Dr. Cossitt and Mr. McPherson committed themselves to the fortunes of the new institution, which, in a few years became Cumberland University. Mr. Usher alone, of the faculty, remained with the old college.

Some time in the year 1843, the Presidency of the old college was offered to the writer, who then lived in Mississippi. The understanding was, that his colleagues were to be Rev. J. G. Biddle, as Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, and Rev. F. C. Usher, as Professor of Languages. It was, under all the circumstances, a very unpromising field of labor. The reader can appreciate it without an effort. And it is perhaps not out of place to say here, that one of the darkest days of his life up to that time, was the day in which he determined to turn his back upon Mississippi for Kentucky. He left friends behind such as men do not always find in this world of selfishness and sin. Before him was the prospect of hard work, many discouragements, and of great peril as to the success of the enterprise. The world has never appreciated, and never will appreciate fully, all the motives which were controlling in that case. Nor is it important that they should. They are small matters now.

On the 1st day of October, 1843, he reached Cumberland College, which he had left five years before. Mr. Usher was on the ground and at work. Mr. Biddle had engaged in a female school in a neighboring town, and of course his services were not available in the college. There were seventeen students on the ground. The brick row, which has been mentioned already, was in ruins. The college bell was broken in pieces. There had been a great deal of recklessness and confusion connected with the closing up of the preceding year. Some of the old students had seemed to be ambitious to leave their *foot-prints* behind them. We had room enough, however, for the seventeen, and the few admissions which the new order of things brought in; and we did not much need a bell for so small a number.

The first year closed in July of 1844; of course, without any graduates. Dr. Cossitt was with us at the exhibition which we called the Commencement. He met us with great kindness. We seemed to have already forgotten that we were connected with rival enterprizes.

In October of 1844, the Green River Synod met at Hopkinsville. A suggestion was made to the Synod, and it was only a suggestion, that it might extend its usefulness by taking the same relation to the college which had previously been sustained by the General Assembly. The suggestion was favorably received, and action looking to that end was promptly taken. In the course of the early winter, the proposition was submitted to the association and accepted. At the next General Assembly, which met in May of 1845, the Green River Synod was divided, and the Kentucky Synod was formed. The new Synod embraced the middle and upper counties of the State. That portion of the Church did not sympathize with us. We were, therefore, mainly limited in our territory to the portion of the State lying between Elkton and the Ohio river. It was a small space, but we were considered as engaged in a small enterprize—a forlorn hope. Cumberland College, from being the college of the whole Cumberland Presbyterian Church, had become the college of half a dozen counties in southwestern Kentucky.

At the close of our second year in July, 1845, we had one graduate. Philip Riley had commenced his education at Sharon College, Mississippi. He, with a few others, were added to the original seventeen two years before. After his graduation he returned to Mississippi, but was soon called back to the college to the Professorship of Languages. He afterwards became Professor of Languages in Bethel College, in West Tennessee. After some years he emigrated to Texas, and died about two years ago. He was a fine scholar, and one of the purest and best of men.

A year or two after we reorganized, we put up a brick building containing two recitation rooms and four dormitories, at a cost of about twenty-six hundred dollars. The material of the building was chiefly derived from the wreck

of the brick row which has been mentioned. The means were furnished from the town and immediate vicinity.

In July of 1847, we had a graduating class of three: W. S. Delany, E. C. Trimble, and J. D. McGoodwin. Mr. Delany was a son of one of our early and best preachers. After his graduation he served for some time as Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, and then for a time as Professor of Languages in the college. He studied law; lived a while in Memphis, and then in Nashville, and is now a prominent lawyer in Columbus, Texas. Two or three years ago he was a leading member of the Texas Legislature. Mr. Trimble was a licensed preacher when he entered college. After his graduation he settled in Paris, Tennessee; then went as a missionary to Louisville; returned to Paris; joined the Presbyterian Church, and was called to Jackson, Tennessee. During the war he had charge of a congregation in Edgefield, and is now laboring at some point in Indiana. J. D. McGoodwin studied law; published a paper in Princeton; moved it to Smithland, and then to Paducah. He died early.

In July of 1848, the graduates were A. B. Johnson, Benjamin Shropshire, and A. J. Baird. Mr. Johnson was also a son of one of the old preachers of Kentucky. He studied law; settled in Owensboro, Kentucky; became an efficient member and officer in the Church, and altogether a young man of fine promise, but died early. Mr. Shropshire engaged in the practice of law; emigrated to Texas, and settled in LaGrange; was elected to a circuit judgeship; was a young man of fine ability and worth, with very flattering prospects before him. He fell a victim to the yellow fever a few years ago. The remaining name is familiar. A. J. Baird of 1848, has become the Rev. Dr. Baird, the respected pastor of the First Cumberland Presbyterian congregation, of Nashville. He needs no record such as this article furnishes. His record is before the Church.

In 1849, we had our usual number of graduates, which seemed to have become almost stationary: W. B. Lambert, R. B. Lambert, and B. W. McDonnold. William B. Lambert entered the ministry while at college. After his gradu-

ation he settled at Newburgh, Indiana; married the daughter of Mr. Phelps; was a young man of excellent promise, but died early. Robert B. Lambert studied law; settled at Henderson, Kentucky; removed to Helena, Arkansas; entered the Confederate service at the commencement of the late war, and fell at the battle of Shiloh. B. W. McDonnold has become the Rev. Dr. McDonnold, late President of Cumberland University. His record too, is before the Church. He needs nothing from this source.

It is in place to mention here that this year we added a story to our main college building, at a cost of about four thousand dollars. The expense of this improvement also was borne mainly by the town and vicinity. In the mean time we had Rev. W. G. L. Quaite employed in the work of endowing the institution. His success was encouraging, as we shall see hereafter. He was followed at the proper time by Mr. C. T. Casky, as collector, whose success was also encouraging.

The graduating class of 1850 was one of the largest that had ever left the institution in its most prosperous days: A. G. Quaite, J. M. Quaite, J. P. Webb, J. A. McNary, A. B. George, James Vinson, W. D. Beard, and J. D. Cowen. Of these J. M. Quaite died early. J. D. Cowen entered the ministry, but has been dead several years. A. B. George is practicing law successfully at Minden, Louisiana, and W. D. Beard at Memphis, Tennessee. J. P. Webb practices medicine at Little Rock, Arkansas. James Vinson has devoted himself to teaching and to the ministry in Kentucky. J. A. McNary practices law in Kentucky, and A. G. Quaite is a prosperous planter of Phillips county, Arkansas.

It should have been mentioned, that at some time previous to this, Rev. Azel Freeman, of Newburgh, Indiana, was appointed to the Professorship of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the college. He accepted the appointment, and continued with us to 1853. Mr. Freeman is a fine scholar and an excellent educator. His labors with us, and afterwards in connection with Dr. Baird, in the same institution, and still again at the head of Bethel College, and Lincoln University, will furnish material for one of the best

chapters in the history of our educational work. On the occasion of his resignation, the Board of Directory adopted the following preamble and resolutions:

"WHEREAS, Rev. Professor Azel Freeman has this day resigned his Professorship in Cumberland College; and, whereas, the Board feels the deepest regret that he considers it necessary to retire from the institution; therefore, on motion it was

Resolved, That the thanks of this Board be tendered to Prof. Freeman for his untiring devotion to the interests of our beloved institution, and for his fidelity in the discharge of the duties of his station;

Resolved, Further, that the Board feels under the strongest obligations to him for his Christian, moral, and literary influence upon the institution, during his professorship;

Resolved, Also, that the Secretary transmit a copy of the foregoing resolutions to Prof. Freeman.

RICHARD BEARD, Pres't.

W. H. MILLER, Sec'y, *pro tem.*

FEBRUARY 17, 1853.

We return to the thread of our narrative. The graduating class of 1851 consisted of T. W. Wilson, J. D. Watkins, J. W. Blue, R. D. Gwin, and W. H. Miller, and J. M. Roach (honorary). Of these, Mr. Wilson is engaged in business in Little Rock, Arkansas. J. D. Watkins has become Judge J. D. Watkins, of Minden, Louisiana. J. W. Blue is a successful lawyer in lower Kentucky, and has also served in the Legislature of his State. R. D. Gwin is an eminent physician in Western Tennessee. W. H. Miller settled in Princeton, in the practice of law, was considered a young man of promise, but died early. Mr. Roach was already a minister and teacher of some eminence, but died in the prime of life.

The class of 1852 were W. C. McGehee, M. W. Baker, W. P. Nichols, B. F. Bailey, Gideon Rucker, and T. H. Young. Mr. McGehee had entered the ministry when he graduated. From poverty and from vicious influences he had been brought into one of our Sabbath-schools when a boy, by a zealous ruling elder of the Church; he professed religion

and his thoughts turned to the ministry. By the aid of his friend, the elder, he went through a regular course at the college. He married a Christian young lady in Princeton, and spent his ministerial life there and in the vicinity. He died greatly beloved a few years ago. T. H. Young was afterwards, under the administration of Dr. Baird, made Professor of Natural Science in the college, and afterwards of Natural Science and Languages. M. W. Baker settled in Texas as a lawyer. W. P. Nichols commenced life a teacher. B. F. Bailey and Gideon Rucker became lawyers.

In 1834, the subject of theological school instruction was first introduced into the General Assembly, but in the following Assembly of 1835, it was ruthlessly killed off. In 1848, it was again revived. At first the proposition was to establish a Theological Department in Cumberland College, but upon the revival of the question, Cumberland University had come into existence, and was in a flourishing state. Of course the mind of the Church was divided upon the subject of the locality. At the General Assembly of this year, 1852, which we have reached in our brief sketch, the question was decided in favor of the present locality. A good deal of agitation preceded, but the settlement was made with encouraging unanimity.

The graduating class of 1853 is rendering a good account of itself. S. P. Chesnut, after graduating, was appointed Professor of Languages in the institution, a position which he held to January, 1855. He subsequently entered the Theological School, at Lebanon, and graduated in 1858; was appointed to the mission at Clarksville, where he continued until he took charge of the *Banner of Peace*, a few years ago. From that time he has been prominently before the Church. W. P. Caldwell studied law in the school at Lebanon, and in addition has become a politician; has been once or twice a member of the Legislature of Tennessee, and is now a member of Congress. J. H. Lowry studied law at the school in Lebanon, settled at Elkton, Kentucky, but unfortunately has become partially disabled from paralysis; still, however, under such difficulties, he plies his chosen profession. H. F. McNary is growing into eminence as a physician in Prince-

ton, his native place. A. M. McGoodwin inherited a lawyer's mantle, and it is supposed, has worn it worthily.

We are approaching the close of the writer's administration of the affairs of the college. The class of 1853 was the last graduating class under his supervision. Early in that year he received a call to the situation which he now occupies, and determined to accept it. About the same time in which this determination was formed, Mr. Francis G. Cummings, of Philadelphia, and a graduate of the High School of that city, having accepted a call to the Professorship of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, in Cumberland College, arrived among us, and entered upon his work. Mr. Cummings was a scholar of high order, and a most estimable gentleman, but hardly prepared for the rough and rugged work of a southwestern college. He remained about a year and a half, and left.

It is hoped that the reader will tolerate a transcript from the records of the Board of Directory, in relation to the closing scenes of the writer's connection with the college. The history of the institution is the subject of this article, and these proceedings make up a part of the material of that history. It is proper to remark that Rev. A. J. Baird had been elected to fill the vacancy about to be made, and was already upon the ground, and ready to commence his work. The following is the record:

"February 13, 1854. Rev. R. Beard, D.D., having heretofore notified this Board of his purpose about this time to remove from this place, and settle in the State of Tennessee, this day handed in his resignation as President of Cumberland College, and also as President of this Board; and the Board now being without a presiding officer, on motion, D. W. McGoodwin was nominated and appointed President of this Board, *pro tem.*

The letter of Dr. Beard being read, on motion, the same was ordered to be spread upon the minutes as follows:

CUMBERLAND COLLEGE, February 13, 1854.

To the members of the Board of Directory:

GENTLEMEN—It has been known for some time that I intended, at the close of the present session, to terminate my

connection with this institution. Having been invited to what, I trust, will prove a position of greater usefulness, I yield to the call, and now resign the Presidency of Cumberland College, the Presidency of this Board of Directory, and my membership therein. Ten years and a half I have been connected with the college as its presiding officer, and eight years and a half with your Board in the same capacity. We have labored together in the promotion of a good and a great object. I consider that he who is devoted to the intellectual and moral education of his fellow-men, is one of their chief benefactors. We have not only co-operated, but as far as my knowledge extends, we have done so in general, if not in perfect, harmony. I am not aware that there has ever been a collision of feeling between myself and any member of this Board. This is certainly a reflection of deep interest, and great pleasure to me now. Although called, as I believe providentially, to leave you, I rejoice that I leave you with prospects so promising. May you realize your highest hopes in the permanency and increased prosperity of this venerated and beloved institution! I trust it will long live and flourish. Gentlemen, I bid you, officially, a respectful adieu.

RICHARD BEARD.

The Board adjourned, to meet at 6 o'clock, p. m., at the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

Six o'clock, p. m., the Board of Directory met according to adjournment.

According to appointment, a large collection of citizens of Princeton and its vicinity assembled at the Church, and the throne of grace being appropriately addressed by Rev. A. J. Baird, Dr. Beard delivered his valedictory address to the students of Cumberland College, and the Board of Directory, and also to the citizens at large.

Rev. A. J. Baird was now regularly installed as President of Cumberland College, and afterwards being introduced to the audience by the President *pro tem.* of the Board, he delivered his inaugural address.

The public exercises being now over, on motion of Rev. George D. McLean, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the thanks of this Board are due, and are hereby tendered, to the retiring President, Dr. Richard Beard, for his faithful services for a series of years as President of this institution, and of this Board.

Resolved, That this Board yield reluctantly to the necessity which is laid upon them, of parting with an officer of the institution who has done so much for the promotion of its interests, and for the cause of education in our midst.

Resolved, That the sympathies and best wishes of this Board will accompany our esteemed late President wheresoever his lot may be cast, and into whatsoever field of usefulness he may be called to labor.'

J. H. RACKERBY, Sec'y."

The presentation of a beautiful copy of the Bible, by a committee of the students, closed the exercises of this interesting occasion.

The new President entered upon his administration in the middle of the collegiate year, but with great earnestness and vigor, and with prospects comparatively very flattering. The year closed with a respectable number of students, and a graduating class of six. One young man, a beloved and promising ordained preacher, J. J. Wilson, who would have graduated, died in the course of the last session of his senior year. The graduates were J. C. Armstrong, A. J. Patterson, G. S. Howard, A. B. Stark, E. P. Campbell, and P. H. Crider (English Department). J. C. Armstrong was our first missionary to a distant land. P. H. Crider is in the ministry. G. S. Howard and A. B. Stark were soon called to Professorships in McGee College, and the latter has done something in the publishing line, and is now A. B. Stark, LL.D., of Russellville, Kentucky. E. P. Campbell has become a highly respectable lawyer. A. J. Patterson settled in Paducah, and for a time conducted a paper there.

The entrance upon the following collegiate year, in September of 1854, was said to be unusually auspicious. Everything seemed to be encouraging to the new administration. The number of students was large, and the faculty had been strengthened by the addition of two new Professors. In the course of the first session of the year, the subject of selling

the old building and the property connected with it, and erecting a new building more convenient to the town, was seriously considered. But from some cause difficulties arose, and on the 29th of January, 1855, Mr. Baird tendered his resignation of the Presidency. His resignation being accepted, Prof. Azel Freeman, who had been a second time placed in the chair of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the institution, was appointed President *pro tem.* Mr. Chesnut, who had occupied the chair of Ancient Languages, having resigned, as it appears, about the same time, Mr. Young, who had been placed in charge of the Department of Physical Science, was appointed, in addition, to the charge of the Department of Ancient Languages. Both these gentlemen accepted the new appointments.

Mr. Freeman seems to have held his *pro tempore* appointment but a short time, since we find that at a meeting of the Board, May 3, 1855, "Rev. M. Bird was duly elected President of Cumberland College."

The graduating class of 1855 consisted of H. D. Onyett, G. W. Kinsolving, J. H. Nickell, and R. L. McGoodwin. The three first had already entered the ministry. Mr. Onyett is still living, and has grown into usefulness and a high degree of respectability. J. H. Nickell promised well, but died in early life. G. W. Kinsolving became a victim of the early part of our late war. R. L. McGoodwin holds a respectable and lucrative office in his native county in Kentucky.

It is in place to mention here, that there may have been other graduating classes after this, but we have no means of information on the subject. If there were such, however, it is probable that they were small, as the institution was struggling with great difficulties and discouragements through the remaining years of its existence.

On the 9th of July, 1855, we have the following record:

"The President and Directory of Cumberland College Association convened this day, and after mature deliberation in regard to the endowment of Cumberland College, it was unanimously resolved to adopt the plan of securing a permanent endowment by the sale of scholarships, perpetual and transferable, for the sum of one hundred dollars each,

provided that no scholarship at that price is to be used as such, until the number of three hundred scholarships are taken, and notes of good and solvent men shall have been executed, payable to the Board of Directory of Cumberland College, at Princeton, Kentucky, when the aforesaid number of three hundred scholarships are taken; the notes to bear interest from the time the said number shall be taken."

This, after what we have seen, has very much the appearance of the last straw to a drowning man. Like such a straw, it did not save. It was, however, tested. Three important men connected with the college were at once appointed as agents, to sell scholarships. Two days afterwards, three active young men, two of them Alumni of the institution, were appointed to the same service. Others were added from time to time. The writer has in his possession eighteen or twenty notes for one hundred dollars each, given in conformity with this plan. It is supposed, however, that the number fixed upon was never completed, and the scheme came to nothing.

At some time previous to his death, Rev. John Barnett, in some form, made a donation of one thousand dollars to Cumberland College. This is worthy of record as an illustration of the estimate placed by the fathers of this Church upon collegiate education. It is furthermore worthy of notice as an illustration of the later feelings of the donor, after so long and so bitter an experience in his previous relations to the college. It is not an unmeaning aphorism that "the ruling passion is strong in death." There was some difficulty in collecting the money. On May 18, 1857, we have a record of a compromise with the administrator, by which the college realized eight hundred dollars of the donation or bequest. Some of us would say, with our experience, that this was a very successful compromise.

The Board of Directory seem to have experienced a great deal of difficulty along in the times under review, in obtaining suitable teachers. Mr. Riley had been called once or twice previously, and had declined. The call was renewed in one of their exigencies. Rev. A. B. Miller, the present Dr. Miller of Waynesburg College, was called to their aid

two or three times, but always declined. Other unsuccessful efforts were made. Such repeated failures were, of course, very discouraging, and at a meeting on May 6, 1858, they adopted a resolution, "in consequence of the drooping and declining state of the college," to appoint a President and Professors for a number of years. Rev. H. W. Pierson, of the Presbyterian Church, was accordingly appointed President, and Mr. H. B. Barton, Professor of Ancient Languages. Mr. Pierson accepted, and Mr. Barton declined. Mr. Hiram J. Gordon was then appointed Professor of Languages, and Mr. Thomas M. Ballantine, Professor of Mathematics and Natural Science. The Board of Directory surrendered the entire control of the college to the new faculty, with all the income from endowment, tuition, room-rent, and from every other source for the term of ten years. The surrender was absolute, and it was perhaps the best they could do. It seemed evident that they could not obtain teachers from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. A report of the proceeding was duly made to the Green River Synod, at its meeting in October of the same year.

In the report to the Synod in October of 1859, the number of students is placed at eighty, and the interest on the endowment at one thousand one hundred and sixty-three dollars and forty-five cents. This interest, however, must have been accruing for several years. They had a good beginning for an endowment, but not sufficient investments to have produced such an amount of interest annually. It would seem that the operations of the institution might have proceeded smoothly enough with such a patronage, and at least considerable support from the endowment. But from the record of a meeting of the Board of Directory, January 8, 1861, it appears that the President, Mr. Pierson, had abandoned the institution in July of the preceding year. The reasons are not given. They may have arisen out of the unsettled state of the politics of the country which preceded the war. Whatever they may have been, this effort of the Board of Directory seems to have been the last ever made for the perpetuation of the institution.

We have reliable information in addition to the preceding

record, that the operations of the institution terminated in June or July of 1860.

The people of Princeton and its vicinity, however, had been so long accustomed to a college, and felt its advantages so sensibly, that they made another rally, and determined to establish a college in the town upon different principles. The principles need not be stated here. A good building was erected. The library and apparatus of the old institution were bought for a trifle, and placed in the new. The college property had been held by the directory in trust, only for college purposes, and ceasing to be used for such purposes, of course reverted to the original proprietors, and thus the institution, after a struggle of thirty-five years, ceased to be. Peace to its ashes and honor to its memory! It deserved a better destiny. In some of its facts its record is imperishable. Many of its *alumni* have left a bright record behind them, and others are to-day leaving their foot-prints deeply marked upon society. Could the *alma mater* speak from the dust, she would exultingly say, "These are my testimonials; these are my jewels which I bequeath to the world." Noble and earnest men, may their shadows never grow less, but as pillars of cloud, or pillars of fire, may they always be found guiding the feet of wanderers into the way of truth, and righteousness, and peace!

ADDENDA. In my brief references to the graduating classes from year to year, I have relied chiefly upon my personal recollections. There were graduating classes, however, before I became acquainted with the college, and also during my absence in Mississippi. I am able to supply what would be felt as a want, from an old catalogue fortunately in my possession. From the early operations of the college, the graduates of 1827 were Fielding Jones and J. Moore. Mr. Jones settled in Texas, and attained to some eminence in the practice of law. Dr. John Moore settled in St. Louis, and reached a professorship in a medical college there. These gentlemen are probably both living. In 1828, the graduates were A. W. Wadlington, H. B. King, and F. C. Usher. Of the two former the writer knows nothing. A notice of Mr. Usher has already been recorded. The class of 1829 con-

sisted of A. Delany, J. McCutcheon, F. E. Calhoon, J. A. Copp, and W. McBride. Young Mr. Delany studied law, but died early. J. McCutcheon was a Kentuckian, and perhaps devoted himself to teaching. F. E. Calhoon studied law and settled in Mississippi, but hardly reached middle life. J. A. Copp distinguished himself in the ministry, became the Rev. Dr. J. A. Copp, of Chelsea, Massachusetts, where he died a few years ago. Mr. McBride settled in Mississippi in the practice of law.

The graduates of 1839, 1840, 1841, and 1842, were Isaac W. Taylor, L. M. Flournoy, John M. Macpherson, W. E. Warfield, J. H. Phelps, H. S. Porter, and S. G. Burney. Mr. Taylor entered the practice of law, settled in St. Louis, and died a few years ago in the prime of life. L. M. Flournoy settled in Paducah in the practice of law. J. M. Macpherson was already a minister, and still lives honored and respected by his brethren. W. E. Warfield is a respectable Kentucky planter. P. H. Phelps, if he lives, is practising medicine in California. The name of H. S. Porter is familiar. He was a brilliant light, and has left a record which needs no addition from this sketch. Dr. S. G. Burney is also one of those who need no record here. He has made his own record in the pulpit, at the head of Union Female College, and in the Department of English Literature in the University of Mississippi.

NOTE.—Information additional to, or amendatory of, the above, will be gratefully received and carefully preserved for future use, by J. Berrien Lindsley, M.D., D.D. Nashville, Tennessee.

ART. II.—*The Old Irish Church.*

THE “Old Irish Church,” is the historic appellation of the Christian community in Ireland, previous to its absorption into the Roman Catholic Church. Its historic compass is

from the fifth to the sixteenth century of our era. During this millennium, the Irish Church refused to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome, and adhered, with remarkable tenacity, to the forms and doctrines which it had received from its own great apostle, Patrick.

The Irish are a Celtic people. The Celts composed one of the first migrations of the Indo-European family, westward from the shadows of the Himalayas. In the land of their adoption they spread over a considerable portion of the European continent, together with Britain and Ireland. The date of their migration cannot be fixed with certainty. The Roman armies encountered them in their present homes several centuries before the Christian era. The Celts, after reaching Europe, divided into two characteristic branches—the Gauls, and the Gaels, or Celts. The former are the lineal ancestors of the French nation. The latter once spread over Britain and Ireland, but are now only found in Ireland, Wales, and the Highlands of Scotland. After the conquest of Britain by the Romans, the Scots made frequent incursions into that country. These Scots were from Ireland. In the works of Bede and Adamnan, in the seventh century, and in earlier writings, "Scots" is the uniform designation of the Irish, and Ireland itself is called Scotia.

Their valor may be inferred from the fact that the Roman legions dreaded to meet them in battle, and shut them out of South Britain by the walls of Antoninus and Hadrian. As a consequence of their irruptions, they formed settlements outside of the Roman walls, and gave their name to the northern portion of the British island, which the Romans had known as Caledonia. These colonies were established in the third and fourth centuries.

After the withdrawal of the Roman legions from Britain, the Scots, associating themselves with the Piets,—a tribe which dwelt in Caledonia—poured in upon the defenceless Britons in the predatory warfare of the times. Vast numbers of the Britons were slain, and many carried into captivity. In the early part of the fifth century, the Britons implored the aid of the Saxons, of Germany, through whose assistance they succeeded in stopping the incursions of the Scots.

The Scotch-Irish descent of many American families finds explanation in this history. The Scotch-Irish are not an intermixture of two races, but the lineal descendants of the Irish colonies in Scotland. The phrase "Irish blood," which is a synonym for pugilism, shadows forth the fact that current tradition may err as well as poetry.

If the modern Irish are brutal, we must remember that for six centuries they have been treated as brutes. Ireland is now under a cloud. Her splendid history in the past exhibits the large capabilities of the Irish race. Now oppressed and misgoverned, she was once called the "Isle of Saints." In the seventh century, England sent her sons to be educated in the Irish schools. Half of Europe heard first the story of the Cross through Irish missionaries. Her Columba and Columbanus take rank with the missionaries of any age. While Rome was bartering away her spurious wares; while the Eastern Church was slumbering amid the luxuries of the Orient; while the old British Church was selling its birth-right of apostolic simplicity for the pomp of Rome, the Irish presbyter bore the tidings of the gospel to the Germanic tribes of central Europe. No, let us not despise Ireland. In a different soil, her sons became the fathers of modern Presbyterianism, and the bulwark of the Reformation.

Ireland lies in the Atlantic ocean, to the west of Great Britain, and made beautiful by the softening influence of the Gulf Stream, is truly the Emerald Isle. It is nine hundred miles in circumference, two hundred and eighty-five miles long, and above one hundred and sixty wide, and is a little less than three-fourths of the size of the State of Tennessee.

In this paper I design to present succinctly:

- I. The ante-Patrician efforts for the conversion of Ireland.
- II. Patrick and his work.
- III. A general idea of the succeeding history of the old Irish Church, till its merging into Roman Catholicism.

The early history of the Irish Church is traditional, and the statements often conflicting. I shall present those features which, upon the whole, seem most worthy of credence. No satisfactory treatment of the subject is found in any of

the standard ecclesiastical histories. Neander follows the Roman tradition of later times, that Patrick, as a papal missionary, organized a church in sympathy and fellowship with Rome. He makes this statement, however, distrustfully, and fails to enter into the spirit of the history. Mosheim, even more servilely than Neander, gives the Roman accounts. Several special works on Irish history were found cumbrous in treatment, and often partisan. The work to which I am most indebted, and which I deem most trustworthy, is Todd's "St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland." Of course the subject admits of no proper originality. The work is that of selection, not of origination. Labor is the genius of history.

I. THE ANTE-PATRICIAN EFFORTS FOR THE CONVERSION OF IRELAND.—Our information with regard to this period is very meager. There is evidence reasonably conclusive, that there were a few Christians in Ireland prior to the mission of Patrick. Brown, of Haddington, supposes that the Diocletian persecution, which raged in England and France in 303 and 304 A. D., drove British Christians to take refuge in Ireland. Here, according to the supposition, they formed a few scattered Christian communities. Neander makes the more probable conjecture that the Scots, in their incursions into Britain carried off some Christians among their captives, and that these, in their bondage, adhered to the faith, and occasionally brought some of their captors to a knowledge of the truth. That Britons were carried as captives into Ireland is a historic fact, and considering that Christians were found in all parts of Britain at this time, it is risking little to suppose that some of these prisoners were Christians. Patrick himself was thus carried off.

The Roman Catholic historians, having failed to prove Patrick's connection with Rome, invented many accounts of ante-Patrician Christians in Ireland. These inventions are shown to have been the production of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Mention is made of a regularly equipped Church, with bishops and four archiepiscopal seats. This story was invented on occasion, in the eleventh century, when several towns contended as to which had the oldest see. St. Ciaran, one of these ante-Patrician bishops, figured

so largely in Irish traditions, that his countrymen, with true Irish wit, saved their sacred chronology by assigning to him a life of three hundred years. The Irish, in their native accounts, do not claim connection with one of the twelve original apostles, but foreign Catholic historians make James, the son of Zebedee, the founder of the Irish Church. Since every other Catholic country had a founder in one of the twelve, these Catholic writers thought Ireland could not be an exception. Inasmuch as history did not bequeath an apostle to Erin, the Roman Church, by special decree, supplied the necessity. Like the adherents of apostolic succession, though they could not see the connection, they did not allow their faith to waver.

Several Irishmen in England and on the continent came into notice, and even rose to places of influence, before the close of the fourth century. Jerome, in his controversial writings, alludes to an antagonist who was "by descent, of the Scotic race." This opponent was either Pelagius, or his coadjutor, Celestius. The name Scotia was at this time applied alone to Ireland. Mention is also made of Sedulius, a poet of Italy, who was an Irishman by birth. Other Irishmen are alleged to have been in the Roman Catholic clergy, but a correct examination of dates, places them after the time of Patrick. Dr. Todd thus closes his review of the accounts of ante-Patrician Christians:

"From the foregoing examples, without entering into any discussion of other alleged instances, which are, to say the least, doubtful, it is evident that there were Irish Christians on the continent of Europe before the mission of St. Patrick, some of whom had attained to considerable literary and ecclesiastical eminence." With regard to the condition of Ireland itself, he says with much wisdom: "It does not follow that these Irishmen had received the faith of the gospel in their native land, before they had emigrated to the continent; but there is, nevertheless, evidence sufficient to show that there were Christians, isolated, indeed, and not formed into canonically disciplined churches; but still Christians, and even perhaps Christian ecclesiastics, in Ireland, before the coming of St. Patrick."

This presents a correct exhibit of the state of the argument. These Christians had no connection with the Roman Church. They had no churches, no bishops, no regular clergy. Like the captives by the riverside, they were waiting for the time to favor Zion.

We come now to the Roman mission of Palladius. Through the Irish clergy on the continent, the attention of the Roman Church was called to Ireland. Allusion is made to Ireland as "the barbarous island." Palladius was ordained missionary-bishop of the island by Pope Celestine I. His mission, however, was unsuccessful.

Palladius was born in France, towards the close of the fourth century, and rose to the position of arch-deacon in the collegiate Church at Rome. After serving in a successful mission against Pelagianism in Britain, he returned to Rome, and was in 431 ordained first bishop of Ireland. Prosper, of Aquitaine, says in his *Chronicles*: "*Ad Scotos credentes in Christum ordinatur a papa Celestino Palladius, et primus episcopus mittitur.*" Palladius seems to have been ordained upon his representation of Ireland, as learned by him while in Britain. He was doomed to be disappointed in his expectation of success. Some Roman Catholic writers state that Palladius was sent to Ireland to oppose Pelagianism, which had infested the Church there. This statement is utterly destitute of proof, and it was clearly made in the interest of those who would trace the old Irish Church back to the apostles. It is quite probable that, through the few Irish who were on the continent, and were there brought to Christianity, the knowledge was carried to Rome that Ireland was a fit missionary field. Palladius had gained reputation in Britain, and consequently the Pope appointed him to Ireland. He entered immediately upon his work, and, with a few attendants, landed in Ireland at the modern town of Wicklow. He was so discouraged that he abandoned the country in a short time. A very ancient account limits his stay to a "few days." What follows in regard to him is legendary. One legend is, that he was killed by the barbarians; another, that after leaving Ireland, he spent the remainder of his life preaching among the Picts, in Scotland. This latter

seems to be more probable from the accounts. Palladius is not reported to have made any converts in Ireland. According to a legend, he gathered three small churches of those who were already believers. It is not certain that he left any of his companions over these churches. Certain it is that he did not establish a diocesan bishopric. It is thought by some that the entire story of Palladius is legendary. If it be true that he came to Ireland, his mission did nothing towards the conversion of the island, nor did it establish any connection between Ireland and Rome. The grant of an undiscovered country is valid only when the country is discovered. The general features of the life of Palladius seem to be worthy of belief. The account of his mission to Ireland is found principally in chronicles later than St. Patrick, and the work of the two is manifestly commingled. This fact throws distrust upon the whole history. This doubt becomes stronger, when it is noted that Catholic historians do not lay claim to Ireland by virtue of the papal mission of Palladius. Whatever we may believe concerning Palladius, we are forced to the conclusion that his work had no connection with the Catholicizing of Ireland.

II. PATRICK AND HIS WORK.—The most reliable sources of information concerning Patrick are his *Confessio*, his epistle to Coroticus, and his biography by Jocelin. These, however, do not settle all the points in his history, and the later accounts are very conflicting. Patrick was born A. D. 395. His birth-place was either Brittany, in France, or Scotland. In his *Confessio*, he tells us that at the age of sixteen he lived with his parents in Bonaven Taberniae, which is made out to be the modern Dumbarton, on the Firth of the Clyde, near Glasgow. It is more probable that he was born there also. The evidence of his being born in Brittany rests upon the statement that the Calpurnian family, to which Patrick belonged, had its seat in that country. This assumes that there was only one Calpurnian family among the Gauls. Nothing is more common than the occurrence of similar names among kindred peoples. The father of Patrick was Calpornius, a deacon, who was the son of Potitus, a presbyter. These offices were held in the old British Church.

The Roman Church did not acquire authority in Britain till the close of the sixth century. That Patrick's family were members of the British Church, further appears from the fact that in his *Confessio*, he makes no reference to connection with Rome, and that the Church he established in Ireland was upon the plan of, and had the same doctrines as, the British communion.

The vernacular name of Patrick was Succath, but in after life he assumed the name Patricius. At the age of sixteen he was carried captive into Ireland by pirates, and sold to a chieftain who set him over his flocks. He remained six years in bondage. During this time the teachings of his childhood ripened in his conversion. To give insight into Patrick's feelings, I quote the following from his *Confessio*: "I Patrick, a sinner, the rudest and least of all the faithful, and the most despicable among men, had for my father Calpornius, a deacon, son of the late Potitus, a presbyter, who was of the town Bonaven Taberniae, for he had a farm in the neighborhood, where I was taken captive. I was then nearly sixteen years old. I knew not the true God, and I was carried away to Hiberio, with many thousands of men, according to our deserts, because we had gone back from God, and had not kept his commandments; and were not obedient to our priests, who used to warn us for our salvation. And the Lord brought upon us the wrath of his displeasure, and scattered us among many nations, even unto the ends of the earth, where now my littleness is seen among aliens. And there the Lord opened the sense of my unbelief, that even though late, I should remember my sins, and be converted with my whole heart unto the Lord my God, who had regard unto my loneliness, and had compassion on my youth and on my ignorance, and preserved me before I knew him, and before I could understand or distinguish between good and evil, and protected me and comforted me, as a father would a son."

He describes the increase of his faith, and the growth of a spirit of prayer. He spent his days in the fields, in overseeing the flocks and in meditations. After having been six years in this bondage, he twice, in dreams, thought he heard a voice bidding him fly in a certain direction to the sea-coast,

where he would find a ship ready to take him, and convey him back to his country. He obeyed; and after various remarkable experiences of a guiding providence, found his way back to his friends. In the Irish legends, and later lives of St. Patrick, he is represented as having been carried away captive again, after a lapse of ten years. The story goes that he was taken to Gaul, by Scottish pirates, where, by means of Christian merchants, he obtained his freedom, and returned to his own country. This second captivity is now generally regarded as the fabrication of subsequent times. The acts of Patrick are so commingled with those of Palladius, by the later chroniclers of Irish history, that no reliance can be placed upon the accounts.

The *Confessio* of Patrick does not support the idea of a second captivity in Gaul. He indeed fell into the hands of pirates while on his return from Ireland, and was detained sixty days. This he calls a second captivity. His *Confessio* supports the theory that the years intervening between his escape from bondage, and his return to Ireland as missionary, were spent with his parents in Britain. He says: “*Post paucos annos in Britannis eram cum parentibus meis.*” If we receive this simple account, it invalidates the cumbrously constructed stories of later writers.

We come now to the call of Patrick. His parents, he tells us, received him as a son, and earnestly besought him not to expose himself to fresh dangers, but to remain with them for the rest of his life. Patrick, however, felt constrained to devote himself to the conversion of the Irish, among whom he had spent so many years of his youth, and whose language he had doubtless acquired. He says nothing of Palladius. He says nothing of Rome, or of having been commissioned by Pope Celestine. He attributes his Irish apostleship altogether to an inward call, which he regarded as a divine command. He tells us he had a dream, which he thus describes:

“And there,” in Britain, “in the dead of night, I saw a man coming to me as if from Hiberio, whose name was Victoricus, bearing innumerable epistles. And he gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of it, which contained the

words: ‘*Vox Hiberionacum.*’ And while I was repeating the beginning of the epistle, I imagined that I heard, in my mind, the voice of those who were near the wood of Foclut, which is near the Western sea, and thus they cried: ‘We pray thee, holy youth, to come, and henceforth walk amongst us.’ And I was greatly pricked in heart, and could read no more; so I awoke. Thanks be to God, that after very many years, the Lord granted unto them the blessing for which they cried.”

He had two other dreams which further confirmed him in his plans. There is nothing in these dreams which is not quite consistent with the feelings of an enthusiastic mind, filled with the holy ambition of converting to Christ the barbarous nation amongst whom he had been in captivity. There is no incredible or absurd miracle. He believed, no doubt, that his call was supernatural, and that he had seen visions, and dreamt dreams. But other well-meaning, and excellent men, in all ages of the Church, have, in like manner, imagined themselves to have had visions of this kind, and to have been recipients of immediate revelations. Patrick was opposed, in his intentions, by his parents and kindred, but tearing himself away from them he adhered to his purpose.

The Roman Catholic accounts represent Patrick as spending thirty years, immediately succeeding his call, in Gaul and Italy, preparing himself under an alleged uncle, St. Germain, bishop of Auxerre, for his mission. Neander gives some credence to this story. McClintock and Strong, in their cyclopaedia, lay stress on it, and besides make some egregious blunders as to dates. For instance, Patrick begins his mission 488, A. D., nearly a century after his birth. Patrick, instead of claiming thirty years tuition in the Roman schools, makes it prominent all through his *Confessio*, that he was “unlearned,” “the rudest and least.” The *Confessio* itself is composed in the rude Latin of the fifth century, and yields no evidence of culture. Furthermore, the continental residence of Patrick, necessitates a stretching out of dates, almost equal to that in the case of the wonderful St. Ciaran.

The story of Patrick’s ordination at Rome, by Pope Celestine I., in 432, falls with the refutation of his residence in

Gaul. Dr. Lanigan, a Roman Catholic, in his Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, while he follows the account which flatters his own Church, confesses the inherent difficulties of the theory. Dr. Todd regards the story as so purely legendary as not to demand serious examination. Neander states upon no competent authority, that Patrick was ordained by Sixtus III., the successor of Celestine. An investigation of the subject, in the light of data at hand, would show the impossibility of the account, but space forbids. Patrick, in his *Confessio*, regards his proceedings as irregular, and justifies himself by pleading a divine call. If he had been ordained regularly by the pope, he certainly would have mentioned it. He never refers to the pope, nor the Roman Church. No mention is made by competent authorities of his episcopal ordination. If ordained at all, it was by a bishop or bishops in the old British Church, of which he and his parents were members. The Romanists did not enter Britain till 597.

The date of Patrick's departure from Britain to Ireland, is somewhat uncertain. Some late English authorities put it between 440 and 460. Historians generally assign 432 as the date. Dr. Todd thinks it must have been later, and favors 440. Patrick, then, about the year 440, with no ecclesiastical connection and patronage, and accompanied only by a few friends sailed upon his mission, in obedience to what he supposed a divine call. His landing on the Irish coast is thus described by Aubrey De Vere, the Catholic poet of Ireland:

When now at Imber Dea that precious bark,
Freighted with Erin's future, touched the sands,
Just where a river through a woody vale,
Curving with duskier current clave the sea,
Patrick, the island's great inheritor,
His perilous voyage past, stopt forth and knelt,
And blest his God.

Of his success in converting the natives, I shall not speak particularly. He addressed himself principally to the chieftains of the different tribes. The spirit of clanship was so strong, that in converting a chief, he brought all his subjects in nominal relation to the Church. During his mission, which lasted about fifty years, he brought nearly the whole island to the faith of Christ. The work, however was not

deep, and much corruption crept in in aftertimes. He is reported to have founded three hundred and sixty-five churches; to have ordained three hundred sixty-five bishops, and three thousand presbyters, and to have baptized twelve thousand souls. This statement is both in the language and in the magnifying spirit of later writers. His bishops were pastors of single churches. The church government was a mixture of apostolic simplicity, with the outgrowth of the times, and was substantially the same as that of the "Old British Church," upon which it was perhaps modeled. Patrick finished his labors at Saul in 493, and was buried at Downpatrick.

There are several features in the work of Patrick deserving special attention. He brought none into the ministry except the native Irish. The monastic churches, founded by him with the double purpose of providing ecclesiastical education, and preserving the spirit of worship, were presided over by native Irish bishops. Hence, Christianity became at once a national institution. It was not looked upon as coming from foreigners, or as representing the manners and civilization of a foreign nation. Its priests and bishops, the successors of Patrick, were many of them descendants of ancient kings and chieftains, so venerated by a clannish people. Christianity was their own. The wisdom of this course is attested by the fact that modern foreign missionary societies adopt its provisions.

Dr. Todd thus closes his life of Patrick:

"On the whole the biographers of St. Patrick, notwithstanding the admixture of much fable, have undoubtedly portrayed in his character the features of a great and judicious missionary. He seems to have made himself 'all things,' in accordance with the apostolic injunction, to the rude and barbarous tribes of Ireland. He dealt tenderly with their usages and prejudices. Although he sometimes felt it necessary to overturn their idols, and on some occasions risked his life, he was guilty of no offensive or unnecessary iconoclasm. A native himself of another country, he adopted the language of the Irish tribes, and conformed to their political institutions. By his judicious management,

the Christianity which he founded became self-supporting. It was endowed by the chieftains without any foreign aid. It was supplied with priests and prelates by the people themselves; and its fruits were soon seen in that wonderful stream of zealous missionaries—the glory of the Irish Church—who went forth in the sixth and seventh centuries, to evangelize the barbarians of central Europe. In a word, the example and success of St. Patrick have bequeathed to us this lesson, that the great object of the missionary bishop should be to establish among the heathen the true and unceasing worship of God's Church, and to supply that Church with a native ministry."

The stories about the miracles of Patrick are all the out-growth of subsequent times. He laid no claim to miraculous power, and he seems throughout to have been animated with a truly humble and pious spirit. The *Confessio*, written towards the close of his life, ends thus: "But I pray those who believe and fear God, whosoever may condescend to look into or receive this writing, which Patrick, the sinner, although unlearned, wrote in Hiberio, if I have done or established any little thing according to God's will, that no man ever say that my ignorance did it, but think ye, and let it verily be believed that it was the gift of God."

III. A GENERAL IDEA OF THE SUCCEEDING HISTORY OF THE "OLD IRISH CHUCH" TILL ITS MERGING INTO ROMAN CATHOLICISM.—For six centuries after the death of Patrick, the Irish Church was unaffected by extraneous religious influences. Its spiritual life was *sui generis*. The incursions and invasions of the Norsemen in the ninth and tenth centuries, affected the prosperity of the Irish communion, though they did not destroy its hold upon the people. Both Church and State lost their independence in 1173, when Ireland was conquered by Henry II., of England. The Church, however, maintained a separate existence, more or less marked, until 1535, when the contest between Henry VIII., of England, and the pope resulted in the independence of the English Church, and the full absorption of the Irish Church into Catholicism. Ireland then became as obstinately Roman Catholic, as before it had been persistently independent.

It should be remembered, that while the Irish Church did not run into the excesses of the Roman Church, it failed to arrive at the simplicity of Protestantism. It had no masses, and celebrated the Lord's Supper in both kinds. The clerical abuses of the period were less frequent in Ireland than elsewhere. The common people were better cared for in the ministrations of the Church than in the Roman Catholic countries. The system of doctrines held in Ireland was more scriptural than that held in Britain, or in the Roman Catholic Church. In the sixth century, an Irish canon condemned the British Church. In the same century, Irish youths studied for the ministry in the schools of England. In the next century, Laurentius and Justus, Roman Catholic bishops, made an ineffectual attempt to conform the Irish Church to Rome. Gregory the Great, also undertook the same task. Milman says of his efforts: "Even Ireland was not beyond the sphere of Gregory's patriarchal vigilance. He was consulted by certain bishops of that island, on the question of re-baptizing heretics. He thought it necessary to inform those remote prelates, who were perhaps utterly ignorant of the controversy, as to his views on the 'Three Chapters.' The Irish bishops contrast their own state of peace with the calamities of Italy, and seem disposed to draw the inference that God approved their views rather than those of the Italian prelates. Gregory replies that the miseries of Italy were rather signs of God's chastening love. The unconvinced Irish, however, adhered to their own opinions." Thus it is perceived that Ireland was as little connected with the political and religious movements of the continent during this period, as the inhabitants of Africa.

Let us turn now from the external relations of the Irish Church, to its inner life. Very little is found in the histories as to the exact state of morals in Ireland before the twelfth century. Bede and Adamnan regard the island as an elysium—the abode of peace and order. Its numerous churches, monasteries, and holy men are mentioned. About the middle of the sixth century, Ireland began the work of Christianizing Europe. This missionary spirit seems to be the best evidence of the prosperity of the Irish Church. Col-

umba, one of these missionaries, almost rivaled Patrick in the extent and magnitude of his operations. After founding an hundred churches in Ireland, he converted the Picts of Scotland, the Orkney Islands, and Iona. He also extended his work into Cumberland, Northumberland, and Durham. In Iona he established a monastic school, which continued for several centuries, and furnished the most devoted preachers of the period. Columba was born 520, and died 598, at the age of 78. His life has been made the subject of biography by the venerable Bede, Adamnan, and others.

Columbanus, while less successful than Columba, was more illustrious. He was born in 560, and he preached in France, Italy, and Germany. His name was a terror to the corrupt rulers of these countries, and many deeds of noble daring are recorded of him. While in France, he defended the doctrines of the Irish Church from the aspersions of the Catholic clergy, and in Italy he had the temerity to rebuke even the pope himself. In Germany, Columbanus had the honor of preaching the gospel, before Boniface, the Roman apostle to the Germans, was born.

The invasions of the Norsemen in the ninth century, mark the end of the period of Irish missions.

The next epoch in the history of Ireland, and of the Irish Church as well, is its subjugation by Henry II., of England, in 1173. Nicholas Breakspear, an Englishman, who was then pope under the title of Adrian IV., donated Ireland to this monarch. The document conveying the papal bequest, described the Irish as barbarians, and exhorted the king to make known "the true Christian faith to those ignorant and uncivilized tribes," as if the gospel had not been preached in the land, from whose missionaries half of Europe had received Christianity. The king was authorized "to enter the island for the purpose of bringing the people into subjection to law; to exterminate the nurseries of vices from the country," and especially "to pay to St. Peter an annual tribute of one penny for every house in the country," preserving, however, "the ecclesiastical rights of that land," that is, the pope's assumed rights. Henry's agent's went about the work of spoliation in the same spirit with which the pope had ful-

minated his bull, and soon effectually destroyed the peace of the Irish nation. In the eleventh century, the Danish bishops of Waterford, and Dublin, received ordination from the See of Canterbury, in England, thus entirely ignoring the Irish Church, and the successors of Patrick. The Danes were among the Norsemen who had poured into the country. When they were converted, they sought consecration for their clergy in England, rather than of the Irish bishops. From that time, there have been two Churches in Ireland. The Anglo-Norman settlers ignored the native bishops by the direction of Rome, while the Irish Christians would very naturally strengthen their opposition to a faith which recommended itself by fire and sword.

There were some feudal divisions among the Irish themselves. Some of the chieftains stood out for independence, while others compromised with the English conquerors. About the middle of the twelfth century, the pope's legates, through the influence of the rebellious chieftains, and English adventurers, received the submission of Ireland to the papal authority. From this time it was nominally a Catholic country. Nearly all the authorities fall into the mistake of making this nominal submission to the pope, mark the extinction of the old Irish Church. It was merely a political surrender. The Irish Church, in fact, existed centuries afterwards, though it gradually lost much of its purity. During this period there were two parties in the island. These parties were at the same time religious and political. The Irish party, called in English history "the king's Irish Rebels," adhered to the religion of Patrick. The "Church of the English Pale," was composed of English settlers, and was, for a time, supported by all the power of the court of Rome. The Church of the native Irish was discomfited and ignored by Rome as well as England. It consisted of the old Irish clergy, and inmates of monasteries, beyond the limits of the English pale, who had not adopted the English manners or language, and who were therefore dealt with as rebels, and compelled to seek for support from the charity or devotion of the people. Many of them took refuge in foreign countries, or connected themselves with foreign emissaries

hostile to England, at home; and when the Anglo-Norman Church in Ireland accepted the Reformation of 1535, the true Irish clergy were found to have become practically extinct.

We approach now the final extinction of the Irish Church. The pope quarreled with, and excommunicated Henry VIII., of England. Henry in turn made the English Church free from the domination of Rome. He also attempted to conform the Irish to his reformed Church. It is indeed highly probable that had the Reformation been presented to the Irish people in a Celtic dress, and in the Celtic language, it would have been accepted without difficulty. It was, however, introduced in ostentatious connection with the English Church of the Pale, and the English colonists. Consequently, the reformed doctrines were regarded by the oppressed and degraded natives of Ireland, as essentially English; and accordingly they were rejected without examination, and spurned with that detestation and abhorrence with which everything coming from England was, as a matter of course, received. Hatred to England drove the Irish into the arms of the pope.

The pope, in the meantime, was not idle. He filled Ireland with missionary bishops and priests, who preached not Christ, but death to the English. The fact that the Anglo-Norman Church had been supported by papal power for four centuries, and the old Irish clergy banished from their livings and suffered to become extinct, was now forgotten. That the Pope had become the deadly enemy of England, was enough to turn the scale the other way. The pope was possessed of great power; that power would be certainly exerted against England. Ireland, therefore, gave herself to the pope, in the hope that by the influence of the papal power, and by the aid of those European nations who were hostile to England, the Anglo-Norman colony in Ireland might at length be extirpated, or at least expelled. It is a historical fact that the massacres of the English in Ireland have often been at the instigation of the popes.

Thus perished the old Irish Church. Its clergy in exile, its country oppressed, its people in despair, it threw itself

into the papal trap. Hatred to England, not love to Rome, has kept it there. Connected with the history, the following points may be noted:

1. The possibility of national degeneration. Americans boast that it is impossible to enslave a free people. In the seventh and eighth centuries, Ireland was the most Christian nation in Europe. But now while Germany subjects the claims of the Pope to the test of reason; while Spain is being awakened from the long sleep of ages, and while Italy itself, the seat of popery, affords space for its Protestant chapel, Ireland marshals her millions of deluded peasantry in the ranks of the Holy Catholic Church. The freedom of thought, as well as the freedom of action may be crushed out of a people. 2. The religious sufferings and oppressions of the Irish people. From 1173 to 1535, A. D., the old Irish Church was taxed and burdened to support Roman Catholicism. When in 1535, the Irish people went over to Rome, the Episcopal Church laid upon them the weight of sustaining a State Church. So, for the last six centuries, Ireland has supported both her own worship and that of her enemies. Erin may yield to other countries in the number of her martyrs, but to none in the duration and onerousness of her oppression. 3. Ireland is a living historical rebuke to the claims of Rome. If Rome is the successor of St. Peter, all other Churches must at some time have shot off from the mother Church. For, if in the lifetime of Peter, there were other Churches than that over which he was claimed to be head, the assertion of Rome as to the successorship of Peter could never justify the name, universal or Catholic Church. Rome, then, in self-defense, is obliged to call all other Churches "erring daughters." But the "Old Irish Church," and the "Old British Church" as well, have a distinctly non-Roman origin. 4. The creative powers of Christianity. Patrick carried nothing to Ireland but the rude Latin translations of the Bible; yet the elevating power of the Holy Scriptures, in less than a century, filled Ireland with a Christian people, and sent missionaries to the benighted lands of continental Europe. The indispensable requisites, as well as the sure guaranties of success in the Church, are the Word of Truth,

and true men. 5. The death of a Church. The Old Irish Church lost its ministry through the persecutions of "the Church of the Pale." The membership, then, like sheep without a shepherd, heard and obeyed the deluding voice of Rome. The Church must have a ministry, a native ministry, and a ministry fully in sympathy with itself.

ART. III.—*Who Was Melchisedec?*

THIS is an interesting question. It has exercised the minds of many, and opposite views have been entertained by wise and good men. Some believe Melchisedec to have been a mere man; and as such, a priest, and as a priest, a type of the priesthood of Christ, he having had no predecessor or successor, his order of priesthood having begun and ended with himself. Others understand Melchisedec to be one and the same with Christ. I trust it will not be considered presumptuous for me to give my opinion, and the scripture grounds on which that opinion is based. And here let me suggest, that if we would adhere more closely to the inspired Word, and look to it to explain itself, the solution of many questions would be far less difficult than it now appears to be.

I understand Christ and Melchisedec to be the same. For a long time, there was, in my mind, a mystery connected with this question, and hence, all scripture connected therewith was dark, and had no certain meaning; but in searching the Scriptures with reference thereto, it all seems plain to me. There is a satisfaction in having a clear conviction with reference to the teachings of the Scriptures on any subject; hence, a record of the processes of my own mind, in regard to this question, may not be uninteresting, nor altogether unprofitable to others.

And first, was Mechisedec a mere man, or is he supernatural? It does not settle the matter to say he was called a

man, for Christ is called "the man Christ Jesus." When Nebuchadnezzar saw the Son of God in the furnace with the three Hebrew children, he said: "I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God" (Dan. iii. 25). And Christ calls himself "the Son of Man." While then Melchisedec was called a man, may he not also have been *more* than man, as was Christ? Of all the men of his age and country, Abraham was evidently the greatest in God's regard, since he called him from his native country, and from among his own people, to be the head of the Church and people of God; promising in him to bless the world, by sending his Son through him by natural descent; and also communed with him as friend with friend. Yet Melchisedec was superior to Abraham, since Abraham gave him tithes, and received blessings at his hand; and Paul says (Heb. vii. 7), "Without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better." If he had been simply a man among men, and thus greater than Abraham, would he not have figured correspondingly in the inspired record of the men of that age, who were God's servants? But in all that record, there is only one reference, embraced in only three verses—Gen. xiv. 18-20. May we not then conclude that he was not of the number of the men who were servants of God, but something superior?

The superiority of his priesthood over the Levitical or Aaronic priesthood, is seen in a corresponding light, since, as Paul says (Heb. vii. 9, 10), "Levi also, who received tithes, paid tithes in Abraham, for he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him." And if he paid tithes in Abraham, he was also blessed in Abraham; and "without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better." But can any one, reading the divine record, claim that there is an order of priesthood among men more sacred than, or superior to, that of Aaron, of the tribe of Levi, which was of God's own appointment, for the direction of his worship among his own people? Is it reasonable to suppose that a man without pedigree, officiating in behalf of, we know not whom, and leaving no history behind, could be superior to the Levitical

priesthood, or be a type of the glorious, perpetual, and infinitely efficacious priesthood of Christ, the Son of God? If he was Christ, he officiated in behalf of Abraham himself.

It has been asked, If he was Christ, the Son of God, what did he want with the tithes, since he had no need? A strange question to ask. Does he ever need the service or the tithes of the goods of any of his creatures? Yet he required the Jews, his people, to render to him the tithes of all their increase, which were used for the service of the sanctuary, and the support of the priests and Levites. And the Levites, who received tithes, were required to give a tenth of these unto the Lord (Num. viii. 21, 26; Neh. x. 38). What, it may be asked, did he want with them? Yet he required them. It is true, the priests were supported therefrom; but a portion was burnt upon the altar before God. These tithes were an acknowledgment of their dependence upon him for all their blessings. To this end, and for their good, he requires it of his people. And that the divine sanction and authority may be unmistakable, the tithing begins with Abraham, the head and representative of God's people on earth.

If Melchisedec be supernatural, more than man, who is he? The name Melchisedec is not spoken of in connection with any of the angels, nor is there any record of an angel exercising the office of priest. But this is the special office of Christ; and he was made and is a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec (Heb. vi. 20; vii. 17). Paul shows the authority, the dignity, superiority, and perpetuity of Christ's priesthood, by showing his connection with the priesthood of Melchisedec. And since none is superior to, or even equal with Christ, and his priesthood only is of authority in itself, and forever efficacious, how could he receive honor, or his dignity be made to appear from his connection with Melchisedec, if they were not both the same, he having appeared as Melchisedec before he did as Christ, and the dignity and office of Melchisedec being better understood by the Hebrews, to whom Paul wrote? How could the dignity of the person and priesthood of Christ be shown by his connection with a mere man, infinitely his inferior, and who, as priest, had neither predecessor nor successor; whose priesthood be-

gan and ended with his natural life? How could this be a type of the perpetual and glorious priesthood of Christ? Remember Paul does not show the dignity of Melchisedec, by showing his relation to Christ, but, on the other hand, the dignity of Christ, by his connection with Melchisedec; the dignity of the person and office of Melchisedec being assumed, that is, taken for granted.

Paul says of Melchisedec, in view of the characteristics mentioned (Heb. vii. 3), that he *abideth* a priest continually; and that Christ was a priest "after the order of Melchisedec." This does not mean two similar parallel orders or lines of priesthood; but one and the same. Christ was a priest after the order of Melchisedec, the same as Eli, or any Jewish priest was, after the order of Aaron (Heb. vii. 11). Christ was not only a priest after the order and similitude of Melchisedec, but he was a highpriest *forever* after this order (Heb. vi. 20; vii. 17). "Made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Hence, since the priesthoods of Christ and Melchisedec are of the same order and perpetual, neither giving place to the other by reason of death, if they were not the same, there would be two highpriests of the same order at the same time; which, according to the law, could not be. Hence, we conclude they were the same.

It has been urged that, as Melchisedec was "made like unto the Son of God" (Heb. vii. 2), therefore he could not be the Son of God; since it would be absurd to say he was made like himself. Language is flexible, and in order to ascertain the meaning of an expression, we must consider the circumstances of its use, and the nature of the subject in which it is employed. So, if there is one whose characteristics are understood, and there is none like him, especially in those characteristics, and there is one whose identity is not clear, but he is shown to be like, or to have the distinguishing characteristics of this one to whom there is none like, the conclusion is, he is that one. Paul (Heb. vii. 3) mentions characteristics that are common to mankind; viz.: the possession of father, mother, descent, beginning of days and end of life; and says that these Melchisedec had not; but in this

respect, or with reference to these characteristics, he was made like unto the Son of God. Besides the Son of God, there is none like him: hence, if Melchisedec be like the Son of God, he must be the Son of God.

I will present a case in which this rendering is unquestionable (John i. 14): "And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Did not the inspired writer intend by this language to show that this Word, which was Jesus Christ, was the Son of God, because he was like, or had glory like, the Son of God. Does any one question this? If, then, inspiration uses language in this sense in one case, shall we conclude that it must be used in just the opposite sense in another case? What candid lover of truth will claim this? Then the argument properly is, that Melchisedec is the Son of God, because he is like the Son of God.

The opposite reasoning would stand thus: Jesus the Word was the Son of God, because he was like the Son of God; but Melchisedec was not the Son of God, because he was like the Son of God. Is not this absurd? Let us notice a few other cases. It is written of Jesus (Phil. ii. 6): "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." We therefore conclude he was God: since there is no other being equal with, or in the form of, God. Would it be sound scriptural reasoning to say that he was not God, because he was in the form of God? or that he was not man because he was "made in the likeness of men," and "formed in fashion as a man"? It is written of Christ (Col. i. 15): "Who is the image of the invisible God"; (Heb. i. 3) "The brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person." Is he therefore not God? Again (Rev. i. 12, 13): "When John turned to see the voice that spake with him, he saw one like unto the Son of Man." Does any one suppose that this was any other than Jesus Christ, who calls himself the "Son of Man," simply because he was "like the Son of Man"? He says himself, in verse 18, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold I am alive forever more."

Again the name and title of Melchisedec cannot properly

be applied to a mere man. He was named Melchisedec, King of Salem (Gen. xiv. 18). Paul says of him (Heb. vii. 2): "First being by interpretation King of Righteousness, (that is, the name Melchisedec means King of Righteousness,) and after that King of Salem, which is King of Peace." Paul's rendering of the term Salem is certainly the most authoritative; viz.: that it was not a city, but a title with a meaning. It is not said that he was known as, or was called "Melchisedec, King of Salem"; but inspiration applies the name, and inspiration interprets the name; hence, he must be what the name and title signify, "King of Righteousness, King of Peace". These names are applied to Christ. Paul (quoting Psa. xlv. 6) says of Christ (Heb. i. 8): "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom." This is but another form of calling him King of Righteousness. In Psa. ix. 6, the name Prince of Peace is one of the names prophetically applied to Christ. These names: "King of Righteousness, King of Peace," can properly be applied to but one. They are applied, and by inspiration, alike to Melchisedec and to Christ; hence we must conclude that they are one.

In Heb. vii. 2, etc., the apostle, in enumerating the distinguishing features of his greatness, begins with the reception of tithes, saying: "To whom Abraham also gave a tenth part of all," thus acknowledging his sovereignty; though Abraham owed allegiance to no earthly sovereign: hence, Melchisedec's kingdom, like that of Christ, was not of this world. Paul then mentions his titles: "King of Righteousness, King of Peace," which we have considered.

Next he says (verse 3), "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God." How can this apply to man as man? It can only be true of Christ as the Son of God.

It has been said that the expression "without father, without mother, without descent," only means that no man knew his pedigree; that he had no genealogical record. Let it be remembered that Paul was writing to the Hebrews, among whom the loss of genealogical record had a degrading effect;

so that the priest in this condition was degraded from his priestly office (Ezra ii. 62). But this is spoken of Melchisedec as a mark of distinguishing superiority, both as to his person and priesthood: hence it could not refer to the loss of genealogical record. Moreover, Melchisedec appeared before Jewish genealogy began. Further, all that is known or written of him is by inspiration. The same mind that knew and revealed this much, knew and could have revealed his descent and genealogy, if he had any; hence we conclude that he had no human genealogy or descent; that what is revealed respecting him is literal fact; and that, indeed, he was "made like unto the Son of God," "without beginning of days or end of life," and, therefore, being a priest, "he abideth a priest continually."

Considering him as a mere man, and as such, the type of Christ in person and priesthood, the only point there can possibly be, is that of his being without predecessor or successor; but how could that priesthood, which was so transient in its character, that it began and ended in the life of a single man, whatever his character may be, how could such a priesthood correctly typify the priesthood of Christ, in its dignity, efficacy, and perpetuity? And how could the dignity and perpetuity of Christ, in his person and priesthood, be made to appear by showing his relation and similitude to such a man? as Paul has done with reference to Christ and Melchisedec. Is it not then clear, that Melchisedec and Christ are one?

ART. IV.—*Religion and the Constitution.*

RELIGION is the fundamental principle which underlies all human character and governs all human actions. All men are religious; each heart has its deity; and the attributes and character of the deity most surely determine the character,

the life of the worshiper. So that, since the nation is a collection of individuals, the national character depends upon the combination and resultant force of the various religions entertained among its people.

This is more especially true in a republican government like our own, in which the will of each citizen is conveyed to the governing power, and, being embodied in the official acts of the various departments, is thus diffused throughout the entire political body.

The people of the United States, at the time of the adoption of the present Constitution, were essentially Christian. Those who were not Christians in belief and practice were, for the most part, largely under the influence of Christianity; so that Christianity was an important element of the national character or Constitution; and we find that when, in 1787, a convention of statesmen was assembled at Philadelphia for the purpose of incorporating this national character in a written governmental Constitution, the Christian element was recognized, to some extent at least, in that instrument. All the dates used in the Constitution, were reckoned from the Christian era—the birth of Christ. It was provided that the President of the United States should not be required to consider legislative acts on the Christian Sabbath; and, in deference to a certain Christian element of our society, who hold conscientious scruples against taking the legal oath, it was provided that a simple affirmation might be used instead. These several provisions, as well as the general tenor of the Constitution, clearly mark it as fit expression or instrument of evidence for the Christian character of the nation. In the various State Constitutions, the matter is set forth still more plainly; and in some of these, the right to hold office, or to testify in the courts, is denied to those who disbelieve the existence of God, or of a future state of rewards and punishments.

In the early history of our country, the people scarcely knew any deity save the God of the Bible. Religion to them meant Christianity. They perhaps never dreamed that in less than a century there might be established upon their own soil, temples to almost every heathen god known among men;

and, being zealous to preserve that liberty of conscience which their fathers had obtained at so great a cost, it is not strange that the first Congress of our present government should propose, and that the States should ratify an amendment to the Constitution, declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or *prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*"

According to the decision of the Supreme Court, this prohibition does not apply to the legislation of the State governments, as some have taken for granted, but simply to the national legislation. Any state may establish religion, or may prevent such exercise of religion as it may choose. But the Constitution of the United States, in this first amendment, provides that in the territories, in the District of Columbia, and in all places over which Congress has exclusive control, there shall be granted to every man the full and free exercise of whatever religion he may profess. And this clause stands as a model, which has been embodied, with more or less modification, into many of the State Constitutions.

The term religion means: Any system of faith and practice; and perhaps no other word ever found in the world's vocabulary, has so wide an application; no other word includes so many varied, contrasted, and conflicting elements. For as the hearts and lives of men, and as the souls and characters of nations have differed among themselves, causing the wonder of historians, philosophers, and poets, so have differed the religions which, seated at the very fountains of human existence, have molded the lives of men and of nations. There is scarcely a crime recognized by human laws, which may not be committed in the name, and as the proper exercise of some religion; so that, when our Constitution secures the free exercise of all religion, it is at the same time securing the free exercise of almost all kinds of crime.

The Mormons, in Utah, may marry wives by the score, and continue in the perpetration of those deeds of darkness which have blackened the fame of our country; and yet, if brought before the courts, these pious "Latter Day Saints" may consistently and triumphantly plead: "Our Constitution secures to us the free exercise of our religion." Catholicism

may bring the pope to our shores, and establish his ecclesiastical capitol at Washington City, and in the Rome of America it may revive the inquisition, with its dungeons, its racks, its drying pans, and its "Burnt Field" adjoining, all in constant use, in punishing those heaven-insulting heretics who have dared for themselves to read the Word of God; and, should our government do aught to molest its institutions, with defiance may it reply: "Your Constitution secure to us the free exercise of our religion." Our western territory may abound with temples to every heathen deity known and worshiped among the degraded inhabitants of the East; a thousand altars may be stained with the blood of human sacrifices; every river may bear upon its bosom the offspring of deluded parents, yet, should Congress dare to molest them, the gory-handed priests of these murderous rites may point to the Constitution, and in mockery respond: "The great and good America does not allow its representatives to abridge the religious liberty of any citizen." The god of stealing may have his devoted followers; the god of rebellion his ardent worshipers, and the god of murder his zealous devotees, yet the Congress of these United States has no constitutional right to prevent any person from rendering to any of these gods his appropriate worship.

The freedom of our institutions, and the fertility of our soil, are each year attracting vast multitudes to our country; and these, coming from every nation of the earth, are bringing with them, and practicing in their new homes, a greater variety of religions than has ever been found in any other nation in the world's history; still the general government can do nothing to prevent whatever practices pertain to their various systems. And this clause of the Constitution is educating the whole people into the belief that whatever is done in the name of religion, should be permitted by law, so that it is becoming more difficult to enact and execute local laws against any act which claims to be a religious practice.

It may be maintained that many crimes are committed under the guise of religion, which are not the proper exercise thereof. But who shall decide what is the proper exercise of

a given religion? No department of government can exercise any such right of decision. Some who are most honest statesmen, and most worthy citizens, hold that all difficulty may be removed by the recognition, in the Constitution, of the God of the Christian Bible, thus making religion mean Christianity. But however strongly this measure might be urged from other considerations, it certainly could furnish no more than a partial relief to this constitutional weakness. Should there be a recognition of Christianity, would not men in that name commit crime? Who, then, could prohibit the establishment of the inquisition as a necessary appendage to every Roman Catholic church in the land? And who could prevent the commission of crime by other so-called Christian churches, which might be even organized for the express purpose of protecting their members in the accomplishment of wicked ends? It would be almost impossible to eradicate crime; and the sanctity of the Christian religion would be degraded by the multitude of pretenders. It is true, we might make the legislative power of the nation constitutionally competent to determine what acts could be committed as the proper exercise of Christian worship; but, possessing such power, where would it cease to circumscribe? The freedom of worship would then depend upon the mere judgment and will of our legislators, and they might easily prohibit every religious act not consistent with the creed of some particular sect, thus virtually establishing that sect. Besides, the government would then be giving shape to religion, instead of religion molding the government, which is the true and natural condition.

From these considerations, we are prepared to conclude that we cannot, with safety, make any direct constitutional provision concerning religion, for religion is above and beyond the powers of government. Being firmly fixed in the hearts of the people, it cannot be governed, but is that from which all government emanates. No religion should be established, nor should any act be unpunished merely from the fact that it is a religious practice. Evidently the condition of the country demands a repeal of every provision, state or national,

which tends directly to weaken its power, and endanger its perpetuity, by permitting crime under the guise of religious practices.

The combined religious sentiment of the people will so influence the legislative and judicial departments of government, that the laws will be enacted and executed in keeping with that sentiment. Those acts which are crimes according to the prevailing opinion, will be punished, and those measures which the majority of the people believe to be necessary for the general welfare, will be established.

We may well rejoice that Christianity is yet the prevailing religion of our nation; that, notwithstanding the wickedness of the people, and the consequent profligacy of many in places of trust, the doctrines of the Scriptures are a mighty power for good; and that, as a result, our laws to a great extent, conform to the code of the Bible.

It is in deference to this prevailing sentiment, that days of fasting and days of thanksgiving are appointed by national and state authority; that legislative bodies are convened with prayer to God, and that Christian ministers are appointed as chaplains in the army and navy. And by the same authority the truths of the Bible should be taught in our public schools, in order that succeeding generations may become imbued with that true piety and wisdom which alone can insure the happiness, prosperity, and perpetuity of the nation.

ART. V.—*Christianity as an Element in Education.*

(Civilization and Christianity: R. W. Church. Sermons: R. W. Church. Christianity, the light of the world: A. S. Wilkins. Culture and Religion: J. C. Shairp. Ulrici's Review of Strauss.)

THE theme at the head of this article will permit the discussion of a wide range of topics, speculative and practical; therefore, that the reader may be relieved from any anxiety

about being led through through the mazy labyrinths of a metaphysical disquisition, I will state, at the outset, that it will be mainly with the practical phases of the question that we will have to do at the present.

I present this subject with less hesitancy, because, at this time, the minds of thinking people are directed to the great questions shaping the educational work of the age. Conflicting theories are urged by ardent votaries, and the contest is waxing warmer throughout our country. Exclusive secularity is called for on the one hand; while others look with painful anxiety, on a state of things that would place the education of the youth on the same moral basis as the building of a railroad.

The true object of education is the elevation of our race. Mankind is found in mental and moral darkness. "Light is come into the world," intellectual and spiritual, and the work of educating should afford every facility for that light to permeate the entire being.

It is a painful fact, that many educators of this day, in laying plans of intellectual culture, and in founding institutions of learning, wholly ignore man's spiritual part, and deny that any necessary relation exists between his intellectual and spiritual natures. But man, in every phase of his existence, asserts his spiritual being. He cannot be dismantled of it. It may be misshaped, dwarfed, or ignored, yet it controls the man, and gives cast to all his acts, direction to all his energies. Our intellectual and spiritual natures are so related, that what affects one affects the other. The development of the one aids the development of the other; the neglect of the one contracts the other, or, at least, prevents its proper expansion. Different as are their spheres, they are in beautiful harmony. As soon could we find a principle of variance between the members of our planetary system, as in man's natures; and "had no original catastrophe occurred in the moral world, had no malignant upheaval disturbed and displaced the equilibrium of man's internal forces, the uniformity and the grandeur of his career would have eclipsed the united splendor of suns and satellites."

The cultivated nations of antiquity failed to sustain a civi-

lization, and we look with wonder and regret on their failure. The cause of this failure has been anxiously sought for by the most earnest philanthropists of our times; sought for, that the nations of to-day may avoid the rock on which they were wrecked. With them the intellect was cultivated, the æsthetic powers refined to a degree not inferior to our own, but the means to meet their spiritual wants were not discovered.

A glance at the ethics of the golden age of antiquity will serve to illustrate our subject. *The one prevailing characteristic of pagan morality, is its weakness² of Christianity, its power. The one issues in the moan: " *Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor;*" (I see and approve better things, I follow worse things); the other, in the jubilant cry: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." In studying the moral life of the nations of the world at the epoch of the advent of Christ, there is nothing strikes us so forcibly as the sense of powerlessness. Beautiful sayings abounded in the literature of the time, and the enemies of faith have assiduously gathered them, with a view of showing that the gospel was needless. Clearer conceptions of a standard that might be attained by man, but served to show how utterly, how hopelessly, they failed to reach it. It has been well said, that with God, hope, and to-morrow, a man is never vanquished in the battle with the world. But the only God in whom the Romans of those days believed very earnestly, was the majesty of Rome embodied in the Emperor. How eagerly did the Roman world hurry to invoke the deified Augustus. They would fain believe that the world, even in its decrepitude, had once again produced a god, and his worship was, in principle, the only one spread throughout the whole Empire—a really universal one. The age of Tiberius Cæsar was worthy of its ruler. "Never did men live under such a crushing sense of degradation; never did they look back with more regret; never were the vices that spring out of despair so rife; never was sensuality cultivated so methodically; never did poetry curdle so readily into satire; never was genius so much soured by cynicism, and never was

*Wilkins.

calumny so gross, or so abundant, or so readily believed." A true picture of the moral and social state of the Romans at this time is ghastly with the hues of death. In the Epistle to the Romans, a picture is presented which may be more than filled, in detail, from the history of the times. The popular religions were either utterly impotent to check the wide-spread and rapidly growing vice, or they tended greatly to foster it.

The only philosophy that had any influence, was the philosophy of despair. The philosophy of the schools spoke without authority; and distracted, with the multitude of conflicting sects, the patient yet bewildered inquirer. Wearied with the endless metaphysical subtleties of the academies, which ended only in universal skepticism, all attempts to attain to truth by means of dialectics were abandoned. The natural life of the Epicureans was one in which the passions and desires should have free play within the bounds which a prudent self-interest would fix. The "life according to nature" of the Stoics, was a stern subjection of all else to the laws of abstract thought. The most impressive treatise on "The Advantages and Necessity of the Christian Revelation," is to be found in the "Annals of Tacitus"; the most striking commentary on it, the Satires of Juvenal and Persius.

The heart of the Roman world was devoted to *ennui*. It was, says Seneca, like the hero of Homer, who kept sometimes, sitting, sometimes standing, in the restlessness of his malady. It was sick, not only from the shocks it had received, but with a profound disgust at all things. Crime alone could excite sensation. Seneca said: "No one has strength enough to rise by himself; some one must reach out a hand to help him." But that hand was nowhere seen; and pagan morality, that was based on a proud assertion of strength, ended by confessing its utter and miserable weakness. Yet this age was one of culture; it had everything that we have, that was necessary for human improvement, for the elevation of society, except the BIBLE. The Romans had literature and the arts; a literature which we esteem a high grade of scholarship to be familiar with, and arts which our masters en-

deavor to imitate. They had laws, statesmen, orators, and generals; they had everything essential to the enjoyment of a most refined society, except the purifying influence of the Christian religion. "The world by wisdom knew not God," and this want of true knowledge proved its ruin.

The best teachings of the best masters of the ancient world failed to produce purifying results in their disciples. Often the everyday life of the master himself was in sad contrast with his teaching. The Greek religion dissipated in imaginative myths. The oriental religions were lost in vain cosmogonies, and the human mind, burthened with immortality, was adrift without chart or compass. The wisdom of the world was at its wit's end; "death, moral and spiritual, was fast enveloping the land, where, in earlier years, Plato had preached and Aristotle taught; and the first pulse of life that stirred in its veins, was aroused, when a Jew, from Tarsus, proclaimed in the forum of Athens, to 'certain philosophers of the Epicureans and the Stoics,' *Jesus and the resurrection.*"*

Man's views of his relations here and his destiny hereafter were narrowed. Nor can we hope to escape this contracting influence if we neglect the proper culture of our religious nature. For we are in danger, in the highest condition of intellectual culture, from the narrowing of man's horizon; and we need protection against it, which a secular education cannot give.

I call a narrowing of man's horizon, whatever tends to drop or put out of view, the supreme value of the spiritual part of man; to cloud the thought of God in relation to it; or to obscure the proportion between what is and what we look forward to—the temporary or provisional character of the utmost we see here. To have fought against and to have triumphed over this tendency, is the great achievement of Christianity. We hardly have the measure to estimate the greatness of it; of having kept alive, through such centuries as society has traversed, the pure and strong faith in man's divine relationship; of having been able to withstand the constant, enormous pressure of what was daily seen and felt, not only of the solemn, unbroken order of the natural world,

*Wilkins.

but the clogs and fetters of customs; of the wearing down, the leveling of high thought and purpose, which is always going on in society; of the noble mingled with the vile; of character in man, or bodies of men, insensibly deteriorating and falling away from its standard; of wisdom hardly won, and wasted. I say for Christianity to have fought against, and to have triumphed over, this tendency, is its great achievement. For a religion to have been proof against all this, and, through it all, to have preserved itself the same, unwornout, and still to be able to make men hold fast by faith and hope in the invisible, is, among the wonders of history, one of the greatest and most impressive.

But the pressure is still going on, and to yield to it, and let that faith and hope pass from the common heritage, would be a disaster for which nothing conceivable could compensate. There is still the inevitable temptation to make our experience, our one-sided experience and accidental habits of thought, the measure of the eternal laws of the Most High. Against this weight and pressure of the actual, the customary, the natural, intellectual culture, by itself, is not able to help us. For its main work and claim is to adorn and regulate the present scene; this is its confessed province; here is its glory and triumph.

I am not forgetting whatever strengthens character and refines thought. I do not forget the enlargement of even religious ideas, as knowledge widens. I cannot but speak with respect, and the deepest thankfulness, of that dispensation of order and light—no doubt with much of evil and danger, yet fruitful of blessings and bright with hope—under which we, this day, live. But mental culture, in its professed aim, is content with the present; and they whom it monopolizes, will be content with it too. In its highest form it is “of the earth, earthy”; mistress and minister of the truths and morals of this earth, but like this earth, only to last its time and pass away. Against the tendency to look at everything from a secular standpoint, it cannot protect us; and to confine ourselves to its point of view, is to lose sight of all that is highest in man’s hope.

Every occupation, every province of human interest, has

its special temptations to narrowness of view and shortness of thought. We are accustomed to be told this about theology, and who can doubt its truth? But just as true is it, that the same vice infests deeply the generalizations of the philosopher, and the judgments of the statesman.

A high-toned religious culture would act as a common tie to bind together all professions. However wide asunder the different professions lead the intellectual faculties, a healthy religious culture would maintain between them a common relationship. Religious culture keeps alive true philosophy, causes us to feel a common interest for all classes of our race, and keeps before us our common origin, our common responsibility, our common destiny.

It has been well said that "there is no narrowing so deadly as the narrowing of man's horizon of spiritual things; no worse evil could befall him here than to lose sight of heaven." Mental culture cannot prevent this, nor compensate for it. No progress of science, no conquest over wrong and selfishness in society, no possession of abstract truth, can indemnify us for an enfeebled hold on the highest and central truths of humanity.

Intellectual culture is, by itself, but a precarious safe-guard for our most sacred interests. By itself, it throws itself upon nature, and in some of its leading and most powerful representatives, looks back longingly to the pagan ethics already mentioned.

We think much of purity with all its consequences; that idea and family of thoughts, which is, perhaps, the characteristic distinction between the old world of morality and feeling and the new. It is the flower of the Christian graces, witnessed by the care with which it has been fostered from the first; witnessed, alas! in other and sadder ways, in the mistaken and wild expedients to cherish it, in the monstrous machinery brought into action to make up for the sluggishness or perversions of conscience.

The Christian idea of purity has still a hold on our society, imperfect enough, but who can tell what it contributes to the peace, and grace, and charm of what is so large a part of our earthly happiness. The French politico-philosophers, of

the eighteenth century, clamored for a return to nature, in the administration of civil government, as well as in the organization of the social relations. They made the experiment, and paid its price in rivers of blood. They repudiated the Christian's God, buried the Christian's Bible, abolished the Christian's Sabbath, and mocked at immortality. They let exclusive secularity have full sway; they removed the restraints of religion, and turned loose the baser passions of both sexes. Purity was in low repute; virtue was not respected.

Loose thinkers may be fascinated by a freedom from the moral restraints imposed by the Bible; but the sober thought of the true philanthropist will ever look to the Christian religion as the only safe-guard to purity and virtue. Can we ask a more anxious question, than whether society will continue to esteem and cherish these ideas of purity? Is it not too much to hope that secular education will adopt and protect these ideas? The passions which assail them are constant forces, and as powerful as they are constant.

When we talk of the influences which mould society, we use large and vague words, which we are not always able to explain and develop; but there is one form and element of this influence which is not too subtle and fugitive for us to grasp. The influence of a system is brought to a point in the personal influence of individuals. It is not by any means the whole, or, perhaps, the greatest part of that influence; but it is the most definite and appreciable part. When men live as they think, and translate ideas into realities, they make an impression corresponding to the greatness of the ideas, and the faithfulness and intensity of their embodiment in life. Truth, incorporate in human character, allying itself with human feeling and human self-devotion, acting in human effort, is what wins mankind.

The heart grows faint at times, when we contemplate the new world of culture and scientific discovery in which we live. What are we to do against the advancing tide of, what seems to us, unfriendly thought, so impetuous, yet so steady and so wide? There are reasons for looking forward to the future with solemn awe. No doubt signs are about us, which mean something we dare scarcely breathe. Anchors

are lifting everywhere, and men are committing themselves to what they may meet with on the sea. Coming events, as yet, only cast their shadows before, causing us to feel, though we cannot see, that imminent danger awaits us. "The present crisis," says a recent writer,* "sits and broods, like an awful incubus, on the minds, hearts, and imaginations of all thinking men. Materialism, sitting in the schools, and speaking through the forms of philosophy, eliminating a personal God from the universe, is the direful Upas, infecting the moral life of all who inhale its malaria. And the spirit of materialism, infused into the transactions of business and common life, is the angel of pestilence dropping the seeds of death from its black wings wherever it sweeps."

But to be filled with awe, is to be filled neither with despair nor fear, and dark days have been before. A Christianity, which has come out alive from the darkness of the tenth century, the immeasurable corruption of the fifteenth, the religious policy of the sixteenth, and the philosophy commenting on the morals of the eighteenth, may face, without shrinking, even the subtle perils of our own nineteenth century. This is an age of speculation; nor need we have fears of philosophic investigation. This is consonant with an advanced state of culture, combined with its general diffusion. Formerly the influence of philosophical speculation was confined within a narrow circle. There was a wide chasm between the philosopher and the masses of the people. It is otherwise now. We are, in fact, scarcely aware of the permeating influence of the philosophies of the day, "falsely so called." A Herbert Spencer, beyond the Atlantic, utters his specious materialistic views of education, wholly ignoring God and spirit; they are re-echoed by the secular educators of our own country, and retailed in our country villages and district school-houses, by small lecturers, who neither know their source nor comprehend their effect. There is also a species of vanity in half-matured minds, which induces them to seek notoriety by an autocratic, arrogant, disputatious opposition to Christianity. Without genius or research, such minds are the mere venders of second-hand wares, the vulgar

*In the *Southern Review.*

mouth-pieces of infidel common-places, and audacious pretenders to a knowledge of questions with which they have no power whatever to grapple.

How is this tide to be met? Not by imposing a check on awakened thought and investigation. A recent reviewer* has aptly said that "the human mind will assert its conscious sovereignty over all subjects which come within the range of its inquiry, and maintain its freedom of thought at all hazards. Its prerogative in the realm of opinion is one of those inalienable rights which its own constitution, and the organization of society, require its members to concede to each other. Any attempt to restrain, or to abridge, its exercise by any other exactions than those which pertain to the laws and limitations of thought itself, will be resisted as an invasion of personal liberty, and will recoil with all the force of a resentment evoked by what, it seems to be, an interference with its original attributes."

Thought, however, may go on, widening and deepening, if it be accompanied by a proper culture of the religious nature. Christianity and education have, in the darkest days which have ever overshadowed civilization, been the truest friends. Religious bodies and ecclesiastical organizations have cherished learning, though in cloisters and poverty, while crowned heads and men in authority were wrangling for power or intriguing for place. Learned men have gone begging for bread from door to door, when princes and courtiers could not write their names. The first and oldest colleges, in this as in other lands, have been founded and sustained by ecclesiastical authority, and the gifts of the Church. But the would-be leaders in education of this time-serving age, would wrest the schools from the control and fostering care of the best bodies of men in the land, and place them under the control of political tricksters, and on the same moral footing as the State penitentiary, with this difference in favor of the thieves over our children, that, while the Bible would be tolerated in the State penitentiary, it would be excluded from the State schools.

It is lamentably true that in many of our secular schools,

*In *Southern Review*.

assent, expressed or tacit, to a certain political creed is absolutely necessary to hold a position, either in the corporate board or faculty of instruction. They thus become the subject of partisan strife, and rest under the control of political demagogues.

It is sometimes urged that secular schools are free from sectarianism. This is, however, unfortunately a mistake. On the contrary, it is a notorious fact, that in no institutions is there so much sectarian wrangling, as in these very secular schools. Or, if sectarianism is not rife, there is the baleful influence of a chilling indifferentism, or the deadly poison of an insidious infidelity. There is no middle ground to occupy between religion and infidelity. The great Teacher permits none: "He that is not with me is against me; he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." In some of these schools it is the fashion to attack Christianity; and a young gentleman can scarcely pass for well-bred, unless he entertains some erroneous or skeptical opinion concerning the teachings of the Bible. Hence the vital importance of keeping pure the fountains of knowledge, that healthy streams may issue thence for the healing of the nations.

The results that may be expected from a purely secular education, are of a most fearful character. Just adopt the theory of these modern reformers; banish a recognition of God and his Bible from our educational system, from the district school to the university, and let the youth be kept under this godless influence throughout their scholastic career, during this tender, molding period of life, and the results must be utterly ruinous. The so-called "moral education" of these reformers is without any acknowledged standard of right—a "moral education" with morality left out. What is that morality worth, which has no basis except the caprice of passion, or is a mere matter of convenience? Yet this is the only acknowledged morality of Herbert Spencer, the present "wonder of the hour" to his many admirers.

The Bible's influence is either dangerous or safe. That it has *power* cannot be called in question. That old Bible chained in the monastery at Erfurth, to which Martin Luther had access, awakened a mind that turned Europe upside

down. Luther was an honest searcher for truth and duty. He sought it earnestly in abstemiousness, in seclusion, and finally in penance; all to no purpose. He went to Rome, the city of the dead Caesars, and while creeping up Pilate's staircase, remembered a single sentence which he had read in that chained Bible, which flashed upon his mind like light from the upper world, and the great stalwart German, with his manifold sympathies and obstinate will, arose from his knees and shuddered at his own superstition; and truth, till then for centuries a melancholy captive, uprose to fall no more.*

The Bible is a book that tyrants fear and thieves despise. Wherever it is admitted, read, and obeyed, it exerts a transforming influence; whether it be in the shop of the tradesman or the counting-room of the merchant, the office of the professional man or the halls of legislation, the hut of the barbarian or the temple of learning. Is this influence good or evil? This is the question that should decide the issue. If its influence is evil, then by all means exclude it, not only from schools, but from that most sacred spot of earth, the family circle. But if, on the other hand, it is the true light, and we have a nature capable of receiving that light, if its influence is good and only good, if a knowledge of its precepts is of any advantage to the forming character of youth, then, by all means let it shed its healthful light all along the school life, and enter as a life-giving element into the molding influences that are constantly at work in the most important season of human existence.

Spiritual culture and intellectual culture are never antagonistic. John Wickliffe, the morning-star of the Reformation, was a man of letters, distinguished alike for his knowledge of philosophy, of theology, and of canon law, and many were the honors he received at Oxford. John Huss, Rector of the University of Prague, was the first man of his age, both in varied learning and an uncompromising devotion to religion. Melancthon entered the university at twelve years of age, took his bachelor's degree at fourteen, and rose to such eminence as to be called the "Preceptor of Ger-

*D'Aubigne.

many;" yet who will say that there was any antagonism between his vast erudition and gentle Christian spirit? And time would fail me tell of Calvin, Wesley, Milton, Newton, and a host of others, whose names are indelibly written on history's page, who were eminent alike for their cultivated minds and elevated Christian lives.

Prof. Tyndall, at the close of his recent visit to this country, said that we Americans need not so much the statical power of buildings to carry on scientific research, as the dynamical power of brains. If he had added, along with this, the antiseptic power of Christianity, he would have expressed the whole truth as to our wants. If our civilization stands the test of the ordeal through which it is now passing, it must be well imbued with the morals and spirit of Christianity. An educated infidelity is a great power for evil, whether it manifests itself in the private or public walks of life. And the nearer it approximates truth, the more dangerous its influence.

Some of the most dangerous of the materialistic school stoutly deny being materialists, while they would shock our moral convictions by telling us that thought is only a secretion of the brain—that the rapture of joy and pathos of grief are only currents of electricity along the tissues of the body! It takes a wise discrimination to sift the chaff from the wheat. This species of deadly poison can only be antagonized by infusing into the educated youth, the sound and elevating doctrines of Christianity, by a careful regard to spiritual culture.

I cannot more appropriately close this brief discussion of the subject under consideration, than in the forcible language of a distinguished writer of the generation just passing away. Dr. Schenkle, of Heidelberg, says: "Culture and Christianity belong to each other, like light and warmth. Culture gives light to religion, religion warmth to culture. Both must work for the same end: the development of all human powers in the service of the eternal ideas. For the powers of man can only find their highest application, if they strive after the ideal perfection. To work together, with all the instruments of science and art that our time affords, con-

sciously and resolutely for the highest good, for truth and justice, for faith and virtue, for country and mankind, in the Here to grasp the already Beyond, in the earthly already to see and enjoy the heavenly; the unison of Christianity and culture helps us to do all these.

Contempt of the world appears, to a stage of culture that is still extant, the highest triumph of Christianity. We know better. Knowledge of the world, rule of the world, enjoyment of the world, in the purest and most spiritual sense of the word, is the highest aim for the man and Christian of the future. We wish for a Christianity that takes its stand on the summit of the development of culture, and a culture that is penetrated, through and through, with the fullness and warmth of the Christian spirit."

ART. VI.—*The Doctrine of Causes.*

In the article on this important subject in the January number of the THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, our attention was turned to the existence of a great first cause, and the evidence which the kingdom of nature furnishes us of the existence of that infinite being whom we call God. It would be absurd to think of God as in any sense an effect, or the originating cause of his own being. And we presume it would be just as absurd for finite beings, however high, or however low, in the scale of intelligence, to fancy for a moment that they are not effects. That we, for example, originated our own being, is inconceivable. We are effects; we assume this to be the case, and we also assume it to be true that matter, and all finite minds in all worlds, are effects.

But though we assume it to be a truism that the infinite God gave existence to the universe of matter and mind, it does not follow that he is the originating cause of all effects; by no means, for if acts of obedience or disobedience can be

predicated of finite beings, they can surely be, and be held responsible for being, the first causes of effects. This is the standpoint from which we wish now to look at the doctrine of causes. The following questions will sufficiently indicate our meaning, and open up the subject: Has the Creator and Governor of the universe given existence to personalities, or moral beings like himself? Do they act from themselves, and are they, strictly speaking, the authors of, and consequently responsible for, their actions? We are not now asking if invisible, immaterial, finite entities are effects of the infinite, uncaused cause, for we assume that they are. Neither are we asking if it was possible for the maker of the material universe to give existence to a class of beings, or classes of beings, who would be first causes of effects, though they are themselves effects, for we assume that he who is infinite in power, and possessed of intelligence, sensibility, and perfect freedom to act; he who created and molded the material universe, could, with the same ease, if he so willed, make minds or personalities in his own image, after his likeness. But the question is, Has he done this? Have we any evidence that he has given existence to beings who are as truly first causes of effects in their finite sphere of action, as the infinite is in his sphere of action? In other words, the question before us is simply this: *Has the great God, who is a personality, given existence to finite personalities, who are capable of being, and in point of fact are, first causes of effects?*

If we look at this question in the light of our mental and moral constitution, in the light of consciousness and conscience, we presume that we shall get abundant evidence, not only of the existence of a moral governor outside of us, and infinitely above us, to whom we are accountable for our actions, but also abundant evidence of the fact that we are first causes of effects. It is only on the principle of our personality that our responsibility can be shown; and we shall see further on, that we can only account satisfactorily for the existence of moral evil, or sin, on the principle of finite first causes.

If we turn our attention inwardly upon ourselves, we shall find that we are possessed of *intelligence, sensibility, and will.*

These three are essential to, and inseparable from, the mind of every individual. The intelligence is the *knowing faculty*; that which receives or comprehends ideas. We all know some things, and we have a capacity for learning. We are conscious of increase in knowledge; and we need no better testimony to convince us of the reality of our individuality, and the spirituality of mind, than this.

It is through the medium of our senses that we gather in knowledge of external nature, so that all the knowledge we obtain of the great universe outside of our own little selves, comes to us through one or other of the five inlets to our minds. "The senses are not, as Plato and Malebranche have too often said, a prison for the soul, but much rather windows looking out upon nature, through which the soul communicates with the universe."* It is, for example, with our eyes that we look at the earth with its oceans, seas, lakes, rivers, hills, mountains, plains, and fruitful valleys. It is with our eyes that we see its extensive forests, its cities, and their crowded population. It is through our eyes, those little telescopes of the soul, that our minds take a comprehensive view of the scriptures of the sky, and behold in an instant of time the vast and splendid concave of heaven, all studded with stars.

But it is not only through the medium of our senses that we get knowledge of external nature; it is through that medium that our minds are furnished with *other men's ideas*. The thoughts and conceptions, for example, of Plato and Paul, Socrates and Shakespeare, Moses and Milton, enter the inner temple of our complex being, to enrich, adorn, and beautify our minds through the medium of our senses. Of course, it is not the eye that sees, or the ear that hears, the sparkling thoughts, the sublime truths, and the lofty conceptions; it is the intelligence, the mind, the soul. The principle idea, however, which we wish here to express, and which has a direct bearing on the doctrine of causes which we are now considering, is this: If we consult our own consciousness, we shall find that we are not only capable of receiving knowledge from the material world, and ideas from the world of

*Cousin.

mind, we can, by the exercise of our intellectual faculties, *originate ideas*. Mind can conceive and give birth to thought. Mind is the parent of thought; thought is the product of mind. Some great thinkers have, it is true, confounded thought with the thinking faculty of the mind. Descartes, one of the greatest philosophers of the seventeenth century, fell into this manifest error. He looked upon thought as the essence of the mind, when he should have viewed it as its *offspring*.

There is just as much distinction between a thinker and thought, as there is between cause and effect; or between a spiritual substance and the act of a substance. I think; I am conscious that I think, but the thought though of me, from me, is not myself. You think out thoughts, but you know that your thoughts though of you, or from you, are not you. Well, what is thought? Can we form an idea of what an idea is? Can we get a clear and correct conception of what a conception is? Is thought a material substance? No; it cannot be, for it has no figure, or extension, or color; it has none of the essential attributes of matter. Well, is it a spiritual substance, or an attribute of that spiritual substance, which we call mind? No; this cannot be, for though we are conscious that we can give origination to thoughts, or ideas, and are thereby first causes of effects, we know that we cannot give origination to either substances, or modes of substances, and *therefore* thought is, and must be, the *act of a substance*. Mind can act; it can conceive thought. We can give being to ideas, for we have minds that were made to think. Does this not show us that there is something wonderful, noble, dignified, and divine about the human mind? We are not mere things. We are personalities or powers. We are effects, it is true; we don't doubt that, but if we consult our own consciousness, we shall find that we are fearfully and wonderfully made,—that the very image and superscription of God is upon us,—that we are causes, first causes, of effects, in our limited sphere, as truly as the infinite Jehovah is in his sphere of action.

As Dr. Hickok, President of Union College, in one of his addresses, well expresses it: "The boy somehow gets the

ideal windmill within him; he sees how to make it and just where to put it, and you cannot make him rest; he will neither eat nor sleep in peace, till he sees the reality whirling in the wind, on the top of some accessible out-house. The man, too, has invented his steam-engine, and looks in thought through the whole process of its construction, and nothing can stop him from putting the moving power in mechanical arrangement, and setting dead matter to work like a thing of life. The philosopher has seen the apple fall, and in it caught the hypothetical thought of gravity, and his quickened intellect knows no rest till the calculations of the entire *Principia* are wrought out and published to the world." So that man, on whose very nature has been written, with the finger of God himself, his own image and superscription, can think, and reason, and plan, and execute; for, deep down in the recesses of his mind, he can create ideas, and by his tongue, or pen, or hands, express his new-born thoughts in form to his fellowmen. Of course, "he cannot, like God, put his thought out into the void, and make it stand there by his own act, and fill a place in space for the sensible observation of others. To give outer body and form to his ideas, he must put them on some portion of God's already existing materials. They may then stand out to observation as forms upon a borrowed substance. Fixed upon material nature in such a manner, they become lasting monuments of what the author was, long after all that was mortal of him shall have put on immortality." But, notwithstanding the obvious limitation, there is actual origination or creation of thought. If this be admitted, we presume the doctrine of first causes—we mean, of course of *finite* first causes—will not be denied. There is, therefore, something very wonderful, dignified, and divine about the personality of man. The very thoughts to which he gives birth and being are his own thoughts, his legitimate offspring; and these children of his mental being, whether they be high or low, godlike and sublime, or degrading and impure, good or bad, being his own, "in the true or proper sense of the word, he, and he only, is responsible for them, if there is such a thing as responsibility or morality in the universe."

But this is not all: If we consult our own consciousness, we shall find that the human mind is not only endowed with knowing and thinking powers, but it possesses *sensibility*. We not only perceive with our mind's eye the conceptions and ideas of other intelligences, and give origination and expression to conceptions and ideas of our own, but we are conscious that the thoughts of others, and our own thoughts, when they engage our attention, *naturally and necessarily move the sensibilities of our hearts*. We not only are, and know that we are; we not only think, and know that we think; but we *feel*, and we *know* that we feel. We are constituted to think, and we cannot help thinking; we are constituted to feel, and we cannot help feeling. The sensibilities of which we are conscious, are essential to our being; they are parts of ourselves. Of course we are here speaking of the faculties themselves, and not of the good or bad use to which we are capable of putting them.

We have, to use a popular expression, hearts as well as heads; and as the head is made to think, and must think, so the heart is made to feel and must feel. He who made us in his own image after his likeness, and he only is responsible for the powers, the faculties, and the sensibilities with which we are endowed. But if we are first causes of effects, we can easily see that we are responsible to him for the use we make of all our mental and moral powers. Indeed, this is a dictate of reason, of common sense, of conscience, of consciousness, as well as a doctrine of the written revelation.

Being endowed with sensibility, we are not only capable of various emotions, but we are conscious of various conflicting, I might say, antagonistic, emotions every day that we live. Gladness and sadness, joy and sorrow, hope and fear, love and hatred, delight and detestation, are emotions which every mind can feel, and which we have all often felt and expressed by our language, our looks, or our actions. Sensibility to the true, the beautiful, and the good; sensibility to the false in morals, the base in action, and the bad in character, cannot be predicated of material substances or mere things. In the nature of things, that is impossible. No man in his senses would ever speak of the love or the hatred, the

joy or the sorrow, the pleasures or the pain, of what is simply material. It would sound strangely, we presume, to hear a man speaking of the delight which a snowflake has in its own whiteness, or the fear which it feels when falling to the ground. It would sound strangely to hear him talking of the pleasure which the sparkling dew-drop takes in its own brightness, or the love, or hate, which dwells in the heart of a stone. But we can feel delight in an object. Man is a noble being, a dignified being, an intellectual being, a moral being, for he is capable of loving, and serving, and honoring God, or of hating, disobeying, and transgressing the law of his Governor and Judge. The fact that man can love God, or hate God, throws light upon the doctrine of causes, and shows clearly that he is a personality, a power, and not a mere thing. We were made in the image of God, in the likeness of God, and we venture the assertion, that no man can logically prove our rationality, or capability of either virtue or vice, on any other principle than our ability to obey or disobey, to love or to hate, the Law-giver and the law. "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." "God is love, and he that loveth not knoweth not God." He is, in the highest and best sense, the True, the Beautiful, and the Good, and if we cannot love him as such, then morality cannot be predicated of man, and it cannot be shown that he is capable of sin. If, however, we consult our own consciousness, we shall find these capabilities; and here again we see that men are as truly first causes of effects in their finite sphere of action, as the Creator, Sustainer, and Governor of the universe is in his sphere of action. Here we see the true dignity of man. He is far higher in the scale of being than the stars that shine in the heavens, for he is made in the very image and likeness of God, whilst they are mere things.

But this is not all: If we consult our own consciousness, we shall find that we are possessed of *will*, as well as intelligence and sensibility. When we speak of man being endowed with will, of course we do not mean to say that it is his will that wills. But we do mean to say that there is a free rational activity in man. It is the mind that wills. Just as it is not his thought

that thinks, or his feeling that feels, but his mind that thinks and feels, so it is his mind that wills. We are conscious that we possess this freedom, and we neither need nor can get higher or more convincing testimony of the fact than our own consciousness. We are free moral agents, and this fact lies at the root of our accountability. "Morality," says Sir William Hamilton, "involves liberty as its essential condition." It would doubtless be difficult to demonstrate this, but the difficulty arises from the fact that the statement is itself self-evident, and does not need to be demonstrated. There is a determining power in every intelligent mind, whether that mind be finite or infinite, angelic or human. We are free to act, act freely when we do act, can originate thought and motives to action, as well as yield to or resist motives from without. To deny this is to destroy our manhood, or moral nature, and convert us into things, slaves at the mercy of necessity. Indeed, if we consult our own consciousness, we shall find that instead of our own actions being at the mercy of necessity, or at the mercy, always and everywhere, of motives from without, we have a self-determining power within us, by which we not only can, but by the exercise of which we, in point of fact, frequently do resist *the strongest motives to action*. On no other principle is it reasonable or just to hold a man responsible, or blame-worthy, or punishable for wrong-doing. "Our idea of right and wrong is not that of an abstract difference which exists somewhere in the universe, but of a moral obligation which rests on us, personally, to do the one and avoid the other. The ground of this obligation—or, if one prefers, the necessary condition of it—we intuitively see to be real inward freedom, with the solemn responsibility that comes from the possession of it. We are made in the image of God. As such we are true free agents. We have not the absolute freedom of God any more than his absolute knowledge and power, but we have freedom in reality, not in name only; and this is the ground of the commands, threatenings, and promises addressed to us in the Bible. If we deny our freedom, conscience gives the lie to the denial. We know that our acts of holiness and sin are our own, in such a

sense as nothing else in the universe can be called ours—our own, because we are the real free authors of them.”*

No language could more clearly express the doctrine of first causes than this, for there cannot, in the nature of things, be either morality or immorality among the ranks of created beings, without free agency; for liberty to act from ourselves lies at the very root of our responsibility, and if we are responsible for our actions, as both our own consciousness and conscience testify we are, then it follows that we are in our sphere of action as truly first causes of effects, as the great first cause is in his sphere of action.

Every one knows that the doctrine of causes, which we are now considering, has been often discussed by philosophers in all ages, and of different schools. Antitheists, pantheists, and materialistic necessitarians, are only consistent with their own principles, when they deny that man is a first cause, for they deny that he ever can do otherwise than just as he does. There may be some slight difference between man and mere lifeless matter, but he is just as much a machine as lifeless matter, and, in point of fact, just as much under the control of necessity, even though he be a moral machine; for the moral motives, such as they are, belong to the same kingdom of irresistible necessity. Hence the bold language of William Kenrick. He says: “For distinction sake he (man) may be called a moral machine; possessed of a principle of self-determination or volition, in which he is infinitely superior to inanimate machines. In the operation, however, of the moral motives by which he is actuated, and the actions subsequent thereto, he is as very a mechanical machine as a piece of clock-work. How should it be otherwise when the operations of the deity himself in the government of the world are mechanical? The universe itself is one great machine, moved by the power of the great Creator. It is pride, therefore, alone, which makes man ashamed to be thought a microcosm, subject to similar laws of motion: he is ambitious of being thought a god, capable of willing and moving solely

*See *Revelation and Inspiration*, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for October, 1867, page 609.

of himself." Here we have the doctrine of necessity clearly stated, and he who believes it to be true, is logically driven to the conclusion that both virtue and vice are impossibilities. A moral system, a moral government, a moral governor, a moral law, moral subjects, responsibility, right and wrong, good and evil, holiness and sin, are all out of the question, if finite beings are not first causes of effects. We know that the material universe is itself a great machine, but there is a realm of mind as well as a material universe. We are conscious that mind is, we are conscious of intelligence, sensibility, and will; we know that we are moral beings, first causes of effects; our own mental and moral constitutions are sufficient proof to convince us that we stand above nature, that we are made in the very image and likeness of God.

One of the cardinal principles of the materialistic necessitarian is, that all motive and cause of action is in the eternal and unchanging law of nature, that mind, however we may fancy it free, and think it free to will and act, is after all only acted upon, and in reality is as much the slave of external causation as the planets are to the laws by which they are governed. But is this true? Is the kingdom of mind under the same law as the kingdom of matter? Does causation reign in the one as it does in the other? We unhesitatingly answer, *no*; and our reason for the *no* is simply this: the mind is not a mere thing like the material universe. Mind occupies a far higher sphere: it is a living, thinking, intelligent, well-endowed entity, having the material universe under its feet, as far as originating thought and action is concerned. Such materialistic necessitarians as Hume and Voltaire, made no distinction between causation as it reigns in and over the mind of man, and as it reigns in and over the material universe. Hence their opposition to everything supernatural, and their efforts to undermine the essential freedom of the will. They maintained that the same great law of necessity by which stones and plants, and the instincts of the lower animals are controlled, govern us; and consequently, all the liberty which we enjoy is only the liberty of wearing, with a kind of ease and pleasure, the cold iron fetters of fatality.

Hume, for example, says: "Our idea, therefore, of neces-

sity and causation arises entirely from the uniformity in the operations of nature; where similar objects are constantly conjoining together, and the mind is, by custom, determined to infer the one from the other. These two circumstances form the whole of that necessity we ascribe to matter. And these two circumstances take place in the voluntary actions of men, and in the operations of the mind. The constant conjunction of similar events in voluntary actions, appears from their uniformity in all nations and ages." Hear him again: "Men begin at the wrong end of the question concerning liberty and necessity, when they enter upon it by examining the faculties of the soul, the influence of the understanding, and the operations of the will. Let them first discuss a more simple question, viz.: the operations of body and of brute, unintelligent matter; and try whether they can there form any idea of causation and necessity, except that of a constant conjunction of objects, and subsequent inferences of the mind from one to the other. If these circumstances form, in reality, the whole of that necessity which we conceive in matter, and if these circumstances be also universally acknowledged to take place in the operations of the mind, the dispute is merely verbal."

Of course, if we take his unproved assertions for granted, give full credit to his assumptions, find no fault with his *ifs*, give the lie to our own consciousness, conscience, and moral responsibility, then we shall conclude, with Hume and all other skeptical necessitarians, that the dispute is merely verbal.

A few quotations from the writings of *Voltaire*, on necessity, will sufficiently indicate what views he held on the doctrine of causes. He says: "No person can know what idea he will have the next moment; therefore no person is master of his own ideas; therefore no person is master of willing or not willing. Were he master of these, he might perform the contrary of what God has disposed in the concatenation of the things of this world. Thus every person might, and actually would, change the eternal order." Here the reader will perceive there is no mincing the matter; all our actions are necessitated, bound up in the cold iron fetters of fatality.

However much the supralapsarian divines of the Synod of Dort might differ with Voltaire on many points, certainly the most rigid and consistent among them could shake hands with the French philosopher on the doctrine of divine decrees.

Here him again: "Plants are organized beings in which every thing is done by necessity." "Are not all men determined by their instincts? And is not this the reason why they never change their character? Is not this instinct what we call the disposition? Were we free, where is the man who would not change his disposition? But was ever a man seen on earth, who gave himself one single propensity? Is not the will the last consequence of the last ideas received? If these ideas are necessary, is not the will also necessary? Does not the universe appear in all its parts subjected to immutable laws? If a man might at his pleasure direct his will, is it not plain that he might discompose these immutable laws? By what privilege should man be exempted from the same necessity to which the stars, animals, plants, and everything else in nature are subjected?"*

Surely we have in the depths of our own self-consciousness—in the consciousness of liberty to think, and feel, and act—and in the consciousness of responsibility for the use which we make of our powers, all the refutation of the dogma of necessity, as presented in these questions. We know that man possesses the power to examine, to judge, to discriminate, to choose, to determine. We know that he is far above nature, that he can examine, use arguments, listen to arguments, yield to or resist motives, obey or disobey. He has a dignity which nature has not; he is supernatural, for he is a moral subject of the Monarch of the universe. In the scale of being he is far above the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, or the fish of the sea; this is his honor, his glory. And if he has fallen, if he has prostrated and sadly abused his God-given and God-like powers; if he has become degraded, his very degradation is one of the very strongest

*The extracts which we have given from the three last mentioned authors, are taken from the second volume of the *Philosophical Dictionary of the opinions of modern philosophers, etc.*, published in London, in 1786.

proofs which we can get of his dignity. His very *degradation*, in connection with his conscious powers and capabilities, is itself a demonstration that the Necessitarian doctrine of Hume and Voltaire is utterly false, and, we would just add, a demonstration, too, of the doctrine of first causes, if sin itself is an actuality.*

We shall therefore, in what remains of this article, turn our attention principally to this aspect of the subject. We have already seen that the worlds, and suns, and systems that adorn and beautify the universe, came into being at the bidding of the infinite, the uncaused cause. We have also seen, and now assume, that we are effects of that great first cause, and are ourselves first causes of effects in our finite sphere of action, just as truly as he who gave us our mental and moral constitution, is in his sphere of action.

There is another thing which has been repeatedly referred to in this article on the doctrine of causes, which we shall now assume, and that is, the existence of sin. Sin is; it is a great reality, a terrible evil. Now the question which looks us in the face is simply this: *Did moral evil, or sin, originate with the infinite, or with the finite?* It is quite clear, that no moral philosopher or theologian can say much on the doctrine of first causes, without looking this great question in

*The consequences or results of human actions are *not* such as mere unconscious physical laws would produce; or, to state the same thing in other language, the consequences of the actions of men are not such as the *forces* of nature, attraction, gravitation, galvanism, electricity produce; nor such as the agencies in botany, mineralogy, chemistry produce. The law which strikes down a sinner; which smites his conscience, which fills his mind with alarm, which makes the future dark and terrible to him, which leads him to look out on the world beyond the grave with dread, or which leads him to look on that world at all, is not the same law by which the fruit is blasted, when an east wind prevails in Spring, or by which vegetables and flowers are nipped by the frost, or by which the trees of a forest are overwhelmed when the fierce tempest sweeps over the hills, or by which the earth is convulsed in an earthquake. There is a close, a certain *connection* in the one case with moral conduct or desert, which cannot be supposed, which cannot be pretended, to exist in the other. The operations of thought, of conscience, of dread, in the human bosom, are not the same thing as the bubblings in the retort of the chemist, or as sparks that fly from the anvil of the smith, when the sledge falls heavily on the mass of heated iron.—*Albert Barnes.*

the face. And one would almost think that there could really be no difference of opinion among wise and reasonable men on the subject. There is, however, as every intelligent person knows, a great diversity of opinion on this subject. There are some, for example, who try to account for the origin of evil, on the principle that the whole system of nature is imperfect; that the deity himself is not perfect, and not being possessed of infinite power, and infinite goodness, he is doing the very best, which, in the circumstances, he can do to make a good and happy universe. We shall here quote from a writer who takes this strange, and as it seems to us, unreasonable and absurd view of the subject. He says: "The existence of evil, and the prevalence of much wickedness and misery, are undeniable; the system is, therefore, not absolutely perfect, and we must admit that the deity is either not possessed of infinite power, or that he is not infinite in goodness; as these qualities united must, from their nature, have excluded evil and misery from the earth. Infinite and almighty power takes away every idea of necessity, because if he could not make them better, he is not infinitely powerful. On the other hand, if his power enabled him to exclude all evil, and he still decreed that it should exist, he can have no claim to the character of being infinitely good. There is no evading either the one conclusion or the other, and every man may judge for himself which of the two opinions he shall espouse, as it is impossible, consistently with the evidence of facts, that he can hold both. My reason leads me to reject infinite power, not only as an unconceivable and preposterous notion, but because its rejection is the only view of the character of the deity which is reconcilable with the plan of nature's works, and by which his goodness, justice, and benevolence, can be established upon a sure foundation."*

We think our author, who shows in many parts of his volume great acuteness, had he only reflected, might have found that there was a third way of solving the difficulty. He might have seen that it was possible for God to create finite beings with moral natures like himself, who would be, and

*See Miller's *Physical and Metaphysical Inquiry*: pp. 243, 244.

be held to be, responsible for their moral conduct, and consequently could originate sin. But it is worthy of notice here, that this writer would rather limit the perfection of the Holy One of Israel, than believe that an infinitely good God either would, or could be, the originator or author of moral evil. Having, as he conceived, only two alternatives left, he chose rather to believe in the improbability of God, *than in the divine origin of sin*. And he gives his reason: "The idea of limited power is not only more easily reconciled with the existence of evil and the imperfect state of things, but it is in every view more desirable and consolatory, as it is calculated to beget more confidence in the deity."*

There is not the slightest necessity, as it seems to us, to limit the power, or knowledge, or goodness of God, in order to meet the difficulty. If there was to be a moral system in the universe, and moral intelligences to be brought into existence, to be governed by moral law, it is evident that all such beings must, in the very nature of things, be finite beings; and, if finite, fallible beings; and if fallible, not absolutely perfect. In other words, capable of either rising or falling. We have no right to assume, because moral beings in the government of God exercise their free agency in doing wrong, that, therefore, there must be either a limitation placed upon the divine perfections on the one hand, or that his system of government is imperfect on the other. We have the very best of reasons

*Page 254. We would just say, that the author here quoted made a noble and praiseworthy, though unsuccessful, effort to solve a most difficult problem. His volume on Physical and Metaphysical Inquiries is divided into three chapters: Matter, the Deity, and Free Will. He believed that matter is self-existent and eternal as well as the Deity; that both are equally necessary in the scale of being; that the material powers, without the intelligence of the divine being, could no more have formed the planetary, animal, and vegetable systems, than the water which drives a grist-mill could have made the machinery; and that the Deity could no more have made these works without matter, than a mill-wright could have made the grist-mill without materials. His belief in the eternity of matter, coupled with his conviction that mind, even the mind of God himself, may never become omnipotent over matter, unfitted him for giving us much light on a dark and difficult subject. His views on Free Will are much more luminous, however.

for believing in the absolute perfection of God; but, at the same time, we have no reason to believe that he can create absolutely perfect moral beings like himself. There is no room in the universe, or in the infinity of space, for more than one absolutely perfect being. There must, therefore, in the very nature of things, always be a great gulf between the finite and the infinite. “*A perfect creature* is a contradiction, in terms. For if it be *perfect*, it is *independent*, and if it be *independent* it is no *creature*. Again: To suppose a created being *infinite* in any respect, is to suppose it *equal* to its creator in that respect; and if it be *equal* in one respect, it must be so in all; since an infinite property cannot inhere in any finite subject, for then the attribute would be more perfect than its subject, all which is absurd. Granting, therefore, this one principle, which cannot be denied (viz.: that an effect must be inferior to its cause), it will appear that the evil of imperfection, supposing a *creation*, is necessary and unavoidable; and consequently all other evils which necessarily arise from that, are unavoidable also.”* Absolute perfection, therefore, and it is of this we are now speaking, is peculiar to God alone. No other being is, or ever can be, absolutely perfect.

In order to solve the difficulty with respect to the cause of moral evil, some of the ancient philosophers, indeed many of them, both theistical and atheistical, believed that there were two supreme, co- eternal, and independent causes, acting in opposition to each other. They conceived one of these uncaused principles to be the author of all good, and the other to be the author of all evil. They could not see on the one hand, how the *good* that existed, could possibly have its origin with an *evil principle*; and on the other hand, they could not see how the *evil* that existed, could have its origin with the *good principle*. It seems never to have entered into their minds, that it was possible for an infinitely good being to create intelligent beings, with whom evil might, and actually did, originate; and hence they came to the conclusion that there must be *two first causes co- eternal*: one the author of all good, and the other the author of all evil. We

*See “Origin of Evil,” by King: page 116.

are informed that this was the principal doctrine held by the Medes and the Persians at a very early period of their history. They considered one of the uncaused causes to be *light*, from which all the good proceeded, and the other to be *darkness*, from which all the evil proceeded; and as these two co- eternal principles were in constant conflict with each other, all things were made by them when engaged in the struggle. The poets as well as philosophers, among the heathen, seem also to have reasoned after this fashion. Hence, Homer represents Jupiter as having two hogsheads set before him, the one filled with *evil*, and the other with *good* things, a mixture of which he dispensed among mankind, sometimes taking out *evil*, and sometimes *good*. Of course we have no sympathy with, and no faith in, the heathenish idea of two co- eternal principles of good and evil; though it is worthy of special notice, that many heathen philosophers accepted even this idea, wild though it was, in preference to the wicked and still wilder idea of fathering all the evil that existed, and that still exists, on the author of all good. It is well known that Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in the early part of his life, believed in the principle of absolute evil. He was led, however, to renounce it, and soon after he became a firm believer in, and advocate of, *unconditional predestination*. This, in my humble opinion, was only making bad worse; for to believe the doctrine that God has absolutely and unchangeably decreed from eternity all the evil in the universe, is to believe a monstrosity much more inexcusable in a Christian, than it is for a heathen to believe the other.

Many theologians look upon sin as a necessary thing, as a divinely-decreed thing. They look upon it as something which God, in his mysterious providence, was pleased to plan. They view it as something which he hates and punishes, but at the same time, as something which he, in his sovereignty, desired, purposed, determined should be, and which he actually brings to pass for his own glory.* As Dr. John Dick, in his Lectures on Theology, expresses it: "The

*See Calvin's Institutes: Book III. chap. 23, and the Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. III.

whole series of events was planned by his infinite understanding, the ends as well as the means; and he foresees the ends, not through the medium of the means, but through the medium of his own decree, in which they have a certain and future existence. They will not take place without the means; but the proper cause of them is not the means, but his almighty will."—Vol. I. p. 397. The proper *cause* of all events, all effects, all sin included, of course, is, *his almighty will*. So that if we are to believe Dr. Dick, or any other consistent Calvinist, the proper cause of all our sins is God's almighty will!

In his work on "Nature and the Supernatural," Dr. Bushnell, though a moderate Calvinist, very gravely tells us that, "If there be any truth which every Christian ought to assume as evident beyond all question, it is that God has some eternal plan that includes every thing, and puts every thing in its place. That he foreordains whatsoever comes to pass, is only another version of the same truth" (page 105). But I believe that the very reverse of this is the case, for if there is any truth which every Christian ought to assume, as evident beyond all question, it is surely that the all-wise and infinitely Holy One never would, or could, desire, decree, or put into his perfect plan, that evil which he hates. I have no faith in the divine origin of sin. It never was, and from its very nature never can be, in God's plan, or a part of his plan; and I am bold to say, that if I were shut up, by a kind of moral necessity, to believe either in the heathenish and absurd idea of an eternal, uncaused evil principle, in antagonism to the good; or to believe the wicked and monstrous idea that the God of creation and revelation, is the author of all evil as well as all good, I would choose the first alternative as an article of my creed, in preference to the second. It is not, however, necessary to believe in the doctrine of absolute, eternal, uncaused evil on the one hand; or that God decreed it, desired it, and was the efficient cause of its existence on the other. I am quite confident that the subject can be explained on principles much more satisfactory; and that the doctrine of first causes, which we are now presenting, furnishes us with the key to unlock the

problem; and probably furnishes us with more light on this otherwise dark subject, than we can get anywhere else.

That moral evil exists, is admitted on all hands, and that it has existed for many ages, every one believes. It is also indisputable that many physical evils, sufferings, and woes, to which we are subjected, can be satisfactorily accounted for only on the principle that moral evil has entered the universe. But it is not a necessary thing, and not being necessary, it must, in the very nature of things, have had a beginning. And the simple question before us is, where did it originate? Did it take its rise in created or in uncreated mind? It must have originated either with the moral governor of the universe, or with some of the subjects of his kingdom. There is no alternative, as it seems to us, for it had its commencement either with the creator or with the creature. We feel utterly at a loss to conceive of any other source out of which moral evil could arise. Where, then, did it originate? Where? Was it with the creature or with the creator? Did sin, which is a transgression of the law of God, originate with the Governor or with the governed? Was it with the Father of lights, who dwells in light, who is light, and in whom is no darkness at all? or, was it with some member of his great family that sin originated? What answer can we give, what answer shall we give to this question? O I feel, for one, when I look this great subject in the face, that I can not and dare not equivocate, vacillate, or hesitate for a moment. Evil cannot dwell with God, and it could not come from him. The infinitely holy One had no part or lot in this matter. We must come boldly out with our views on this subject, and fearlessly maintain that the origin of sin must be found anywhere but in the plans and purposes of that all-wise and infinitely good and glorious being, in whom there is no darkness at all. In the very nature of things he could not decree the existence of what he hates with a perfect hatred; and it seems to me nothing short of blasphemy, and the very climax of impiety, for any man, or body of men, to say that "God has decreed whatsoever comes to pass."

The fact that God created all the dependent universe, and instituted a moral system, does not, in the slightest degree,

alter or affect the soundness of our conclusion. For the question before us is not, Did God give being to all the intelligent creation? The question is not, Did a moral system originate with God? for in the nature of things, a moral system could no more have its beginning with the subjects of God's moral government, than their creation could originate with themselves. The moral universe, with all the numberless subjects of that vast kingdom over which Jehovah rules and reigns in righteousness, came from his hand. This is a settled point, but the question is, Did the evil thoughts, desires, and purposes, which spring up in the minds of will-endowed subjects of his vast dominion, come into being at their own bidding, or in virtue of a divine decree? In other words, is moral evil the product of the infinite mind, or of finite and fallible minds? The question is *not*, Did he *foreknow* that moral evil would exist in the universe, if he instituted a moral system? for it is beyond all question true, that whatever is knowable, is perfectly known to the absolute and infinite One. But the question is, Was sin in God's plan? Did he contemplate it as something which he wished or desired? Did he purpose its existence? Did he view it as something necessary to the manifestation and development of his perfections? It is not difficult to see that there is a great difference between a moral system, and moral evil; and he must be bold and reckless indeed, who rushes to the conclusion that the former could not exist without the necessary existence of the latter. Surely the fact that moral evil exists is no proof that upon the whole it was best that it should be, and that God wisely purposed it, and in his own good time and way brought it to pass? We repeat it, the actuality or reality of the existence of sin is no proof that it could not but be, and must have been purposed. And yet necessitarians generally take for granted the very thing which they can never prove. They tell us that whatsoever comes to pass must have been decreed, because God has decreed whatsoever comes to pass. This is the sum and substance of all their reasoning on the subject, as we could easily show from their writings. John Calvin, for example, says: "Let this be the sum of all, that *forasmuch as the will of God is said to be*

the cause of all things, his providence is thought the governess in all purposes and works of men, so as it sheweth forth her force not only in the elect, who are governed by the holy Spirit, but also compelleth the reprobate to obedience.”* “Wicked men are justly condemned for the evil which they do, although God have appointed it to be done.”† “Necessity of sinning neither excuseth the sinner, nor chargeth God justly with injustice, for condemning them that so sin.”‡ “It is certain then,” says Tucker, “that the existence of sin was the ordination of the divine will; sin could not have existed without, or contrary to, the divine will; its being must be a consequent of the divine purpose. Sin is a wise and holy ordinance of God.”§ Such is the logical conclusion from the Calvinistic premises, though many who call themselves by that name refuse to admit the fact. “In fine,” says Piscator, “it must be confessed that God has, from eternity, so absolutely and efficaciously decreed all things, that no man can do any more good than he actually does, or omit more evil than he actually omits.” Dr. Vaughan says: “Evil exists, but the question is, how? not as to the particular process, for that is revealed; but how, as to the origination and authorship of the plan. Was it by *surprise* upon God, or was it with his *permission*, with his *concurrence*, by his *appointment*? I venture to affirm, *by his appointment*. To say God *permitted* the fall is a foolish term; he ordained the fall, that he might get himself glory out of it.”|| It is well known that Jonathan Edwards took the same view; he held that though sin is in itself an evil, yet all things considered, it is a good, and therefore God desired it and decreed it. He says: “There is no inconsistence in supposing that God may hate a thing as it is in itself, and considered simply as evil, and yet it may be his will it should come to pass, considering all circumstances. I believe there is no person of good understanding, who will venture to say he is certain

*Institutes. Book I., chap. xvii., sec. 2.

†Sec. 4.

‡Book III., chap. xxiii., sec. 6.

§See *Divine Ordination of Sin*, by Benson; page 37.

||See *Evangelical Witness*; page 190.

that it is impossible it should be best, taking in the whole compass and extent of existence, and all consequences in the endless series of events, that there should be such a thing as moral evil in the world. And if so, it will certainly follow, that an infinitely wise being, who always chooses what is best, must choose that there should be such a thing. And if so, then such a choice is not an evil, but a wise and holy choice. And if so, then that providence which is agreeable to such a choice, is a wise and holy providence."* In a foot note on the same page, the great New England champion of necessity quotes the following from Turnbull's Christian Philosophy, to substantiate his view: "If the author and governor of all things be infinitely perfect, then whatever is, is right; of all possible systems he hath chosen the best; and consequently, there is no absolute evil in the universe. This being the case, all the seeming imperfections or evils in it are such only in a partial view; and with respect to the whole system they are *goods*." If such sentiments as these are correct, then it follows as a necessary consequence, that Voltaire, and Hume, and Hobbes, and Robert Dale Owen, and all who believe that man is the creature of circumstances, and at the mercy of necessity, could not be wrong; for whatever is, is right. And it is also as clear as a ray of light, that all who oppose the Calvinistic doctrine of necessity, whatever be their character and conduct, cannot be wrong, or do wrong, if it be true that whatever is, is right.

In his First Lines on Christian Theology, Dr. John P. Smith, in answer to the objection that *necessity* makes God the author of sin, says: "The utmost that can be justly advanced in the objection is this—that in the vastly, and to us incomprehensibly, extensive system of created existence and moral agency, which the deity has established, the existence of moral and natural evil, to a certain extent was, all things considered, and in reference to their final results, a necessary part of the divine plan—that plan which is necessarily the *wisest and the best*. But this does not represent God as approving it for its own sake."† Very true, I reply, it does

*See Works of President Edwards; vol. v., page 298.

†See Lines of Christian Theology; page 316.

not represent God as approving evil, or choosing evil for *its own sake*, but it most assuredly does represent God as approving evil, and choosing evil *for the sake of something else*. This theory, though sustained by great and learned divines, is, I apprehend, radically defective. It is a theory which endorses the principle that the end sanctifies the means—the principle that it is right to do evil that good may come—a principle which endorses the theory that evil is not evil, but good, all things considered. A principle, which, I venture to say, is condemned by reason, by revelation, by every enlightened conscience, and by the practical conduct of the *very men* who cling to the theory as a dogma.

I am glad to find that Albert Barnes had no faith in the dogma that God, by an arbitrary decree, introduced sin into the universe. He also tells us that our nature revolts at the very idea that God should *prefer sin*. With respect to the first he says: “The supposition that God resolved to introduce sin and misery into his system as a mere act of sovereignty—by an arbitrary decree—ordaining his own creatures to sorrow and death, solely to show his own power, and because he *chose* that it should be so, cannot be regarded as an admissible and satisfactory explanation. It is not to be *assumed*, certainly, that God is such a being, or that he acts in this manner. If any other explanation could be found, or if no explanation can be found, we have no right to assume that this is the character of God, and no right to charge this upon him; for it is possible that an explanation can be found without this supposition.” See his *Essay on Sin and Suffering* in the *American Presbyterian Review*, January, 1870.

In the same article he says, with respect to the second: “It can not be assumed, as an explanation of the difficulty, that God *prefers* sin to holiness, or misery to happiness, in his creatures. No one, certainly, has a right to *assume* this in regard to God, for certainly it does not enter into the essential idea in regard to God. Our nature revolts at the idea. All men are so made that they *can not* believe it. Any man, by candidly examining his own mind, can see that he can not believe it; and there is abundant evidence that this has been the general judgment of mankind. A simple illustration

will make this difficulty at once apparent: It is easy to see how it was proper for the father of the prodigal son to avail himself of the errors, and follies, and sufferings, and guilt, of his son, in order to exhibit his own character for kindness and compassion; but how should we have explained it, if he had brought all this about in order that he might thus exhibit the nature of parental kindness; if he had made it a part of a deliberate plan; if he had intentionally so arranged matters that his own son *would* fall into those errors and sorrows; if he had, with this view, suffered them to come upon him when he could have easily prevented them?"

Sin, then, is no part of God's plan, it never could be in God's plan, it is no *species* of *obedience*, it is no *offspring of his decree*. It is just what the highest authority designates it, "the transgression of the law of God." It is that abominable thing which he hates. It never was and never can be anything else, or less than this; for the principles of morality, like the infinite principle of all principles, are unchangeable and eternal. Sin, therefore, can not be of God, for its nature is opposed to his. It is opposed to his government, his holy law, the best interests of his great empire, and the holy happiness of his subjects.

It has been often asked, Could not the divine being have prevented moral evil from ever entering the universe? Without doubt God could have prevented sin, had it pleased him to do so. For he who doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, was under no obligation to create any beings in his own image after his likeness. He was under no necessity, and no moral obligation to institute a moral system, and create subjects possessed of intelligence, sensibility, and will. He might, therefore, had it so pleased him, have remained forever alone, and thus he would most effectually have prevented moral evil from ever existing. It is, however, sufficient for us to know that the all-wise, and infinitely benevolent One, did not choose to remain the only intelligent being in the universe. He chose to create moral beings, or powers—agents that would be free to act, and act freely—subjects that would originate thought, volition, and action. In one word, as we have re-

peatedly expressed it, the infinite uncaused mind made finite minds, who were to be as truly first causes as himself. Here was a display, not only of wonderful power, but of wonderful wisdom, and wonderful love. The only way, as far as we can see, by which sin could enter the moral system, was by some will-endowed agents abusing their liberty. But here it may be asked, could not God have interposed to prevent the first sinner from abusing his liberty? Yes, he could have exerted his power, and crushed in a moment the moral entity, before the act of transgression was done; but we must remember that he had wisely, and in his sovereign goodness, constituted a moral system, and therefore such manifestations of power might have been, for anything we can tell, productive of more evil than sin itself. Having chosen to create moral beings, and place them under moral law, to control by absolute power was out of the question. "It does not seem a very extraordinary thing for God to be able to govern and absolutely direct such beings as are merely passive, and deprived of all motion of their own, whereby they might make any resistance. For those things obey easily which do not move but when they are moved. Neither is there need of infinite wisdom to govern them, for infinite power, with a moderate use of wisdom, would have been sufficient. That there might be a subject, therefore, whereon the infinite wisdom of God should display itself, he created free agents; which, being as it were, put out of his power and left to themselves, might act in a manner independent of his will. It is evident to any person how much more difficult it is, and how much greater exercise of wisdom it requires, to direct a multitude of these to a certain end, and make them conspire to the common good, than to order brute beasts, and such as have no power of themselves, in what manner you please. To them that consider the vast multitude of free agents, which is almost infinite, and their independence, (since every one is, at least in many cases, absolute master of his own actions, and is permitted by God to act according to that liberty,) God seems to have given a specimen of the extent of his wisdom, which is able thus, certainly and effectually, to bring to the end proposed so many free spirits, so many agents that

were in a manner set at liberty from his dominion, and committed every one to his own government. Here is the proper place for wisdom, wherein (setting aside, and in a manner suspending the exercise of his power) he attains his ends by prudence only, by mere dexterity of acting, and brings it to pass that so many jarring wills depending on themselves alone, and no more inclined to either side by the divine power than if there were no such thing, shall yet conspire together to promote the good of the universe. 'Tis impossible that this exercise of wisdom should not be very agreeable to the Deity, if any thing in his works may be esteemed agreeable to him. But if he were obliged to interfere with his power, it would seem to argue a defect of wisdom; for what occasion is there for him to interpose and stop the liberty of action before granted, if his wisdom could provide sufficiently for the good of the whole without altering his plan."*

The main point which we wish to establish and clearly express is, that we are constituted by our Creator first causes, and therefore held responsible for our free and independent action. Indeed, we may with safety venture the assertion, that if the subjects of God's moral government are not as really and truly the first causes of their own moral actions, as God is of his, there can be no such thing as virtue or vice, moral excellency or moral evil among the ranks of created beings. The very foundation of responsibility, of praise, or blame, lies in the creature's power to act *from himself*.

This is the view which I have been led to entertain, and it is when we view the subject of evil and its origin from

*See King on the Origin of Evil; page 415. This work is very interesting and suggestive. The notes, by Lane, are very extensive and valuable. The edition from which I quote was published in Cambridge, 1739. He shows that if the causes of action were necessary, or if they were outside of us, we could not be guilty of moral evil at all. For that only is reckoned moral by the common consent of mankind, of which the man himself is properly the cause; but no body looks upon himself as properly the cause of a thing which he could not avoid, or to which he was necessitated by natural causes, and such as was antecedent to the will. For every one blames himself only on this account, because he was of himself necessarily the cause of evil to himself or others.

this standpoint, that we see not only how it was possible for sin to enter the universe in direct opposition to the will of God, but also how it actually did enter. If the remarks which have just been made are correct, then it follows, as a necessary consequence, that sin not only might originate with some finite mind among the ranks of will-endowed and responsible subjects, *but that in point of fact some created mind must have been its first originating cause.* No being but a sinner could originate moral evil, and therefore moral evil must be the product of a sinner. In other words, moral evil is the abuse of moral power; no matter when that power was first abused, no matter by whom, no matter where. The essential nature of moral evil is always and everywhere the same. If it cannot be prevented, this arises from no defect of power in the Almighty, but because physical power of whatever amount has no possible application to the case. Will, in its very nature, cannot be necessitated (for then it would cease to be will); in other words, the prevention of its abuse is impossible. It may be destroyed, but continuing to be what it is, it cannot be necessitated.

Justin Martyr, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, more than once expresses his mind fully and clearly on this subject. For example he says: "Christians hold not the doctrine of a fatal necessity, which exempts from all moral responsibility; but they believe both men and angels to be endowed with a self-determining power of free-will, so that no irresistible, and therefore morally exonerating, constraint is laid upon their choice of this action or of that action." Again he says: "God created both men and angels with possession of a self-determining freedom of preference, so that they might either choose the good and live eternally, or choose the evil and incur merited punishment." Once more he says: "Having learned from the prophets, that both punishments and rewards are assigned according to the deserts of each person's actions, we assert this to be true; for if it were not so, but if all things happened according to fate, our freedom of action would forthwith be destroyed. Thus, if it were fated that this man should be good and that man bad, there would be no room either for approbation or for censure; and again, unless

the human race, by a free preference, had the power to reject the bad and to choose the good, it would not be the cause of whatever things were done. But that, by free preference, man both does right and does wrong, we thus demonstrate."

Ireneus took the same view: "Man, being endowed with reason, and in this respect being similar to God, possesses freedom of will and self-determining power. Hence he himself is the cause to himself, that he becomes sometimes good corn, and sometimes mere straw." Hear him again: "God made man from the beginning, having his own power of self-determination, even as he has his own soul, in order that he may submit to God's behests voluntarily; and not, on the part of God, constrainedly. For God uses force to no one; though to man God's righteous behests are always present, and on this account he influentially gives good counsel to all. In man, as well as in the angels, he placed a power of choice."* This power of choice, as we have been trying to show, throws a flood of light on what has been, and still is, to many a dark and mysterious subject. Moral evil is the abuse of this noble power with which all moral beings have been endowed by the moral monarch of the universe, and therefore *it must have originated in finite mind and not with the infinite.*

He, who is represented by the prince of English poets as saying:—

To reign is worth ambition, though in hell;
Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven,

was probably the first sinner in the great moral empire of the King of kings. We know that he is called the father of lies, a murderer from the beginning, and that he abode not in the truth (John viii. 14). It is also written: "He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth from the beginning" (1 John iii. 8). And the great Teacher, who knew all about this matter, when looking over the great field of humanity, and saw the tares growing among the wheat, said, "An enemy hath done this."

*See *Primitive Doctrine of Election*, by Faber. In this book the author furnishes us with many valuable witnesses to the faith of the early Church, in the numerous quotations which he gives from the fathers.

Let us suppose, for a moment, that the infinite and all-wise Jehovah, before he created free agents to be governed by motives or by moral laws, looked through the entire history of their being—their future and never-ending being. Let us suppose this, and what did he see? He saw race after race of intelligent beings, from the highest to the lowest of them, take their position on the staircase of existence at his bidding. He saw millions upon millions of them begin to use, and continue to use, their powers and faculties in honoring, adoring, and glorifying their Creator, Preserver, and Potentate. He saw dominions, principalities, and powers without number, enjoying holy happiness in each other's society, and he heard with pleasure and delight their songs of gratitude, adoration, and praise. He saw his own infinite moral perfections gloriously revealed to an admiring, and adoring, and happy universe. But at the same time, he saw with the first glance of his omniscient eye, that moral evil would originate in the bosoms of some of his will-endowed subjects; but this knowledge of the origin of evil did not deter him from constructing and putting in motion the wheels of a moral system. He saw that it was better, all things considered, to have a moral system, even though some of the subjects of his moral empire should rebel, and, by their undesired and undecreed abuse of freedom, introduce discord and spiritual death into one or two provinces of his vast dominions.

It would, we presume, be very difficult for any one to prove that a moral government could exist, with all its subjects governed by motives, which, of course, all free and accountable agents must be, without the possibility of failure in duty on the part of some of them; and on the other hand, no one can prove that moral evil was necessary to the successful working of the moral system; for necessitated evil can no more be called evil, and worthy of punishment, than necessitated virtue can be called virtue and rewarded as such.

That the all-powerful Jehovah could have prevented evil from ever existing, as we have already stated, is beyond all question; but for anything we can prove to the contrary, the only way by which even he could keep it out of the universe, was to remain the only free agent in existence. He did not,

however, will to remain alone. He willed to create beings *in his own image, after his likeness.* Intelligent, will-endowed beings, came into being at his bidding, and from that moment transgression of law became a possibility, and to the all-perfect One, who sees the end from the beginning, a certainty.

"I do not deny but God may stop man from executing his choice, when he is ready to make an ill one; for no body ought to presume to limit the divine power. But I say, when a free agent is ready to make an ill choice, and would do it if not prevented by an almighty power, he is already guilty in the sight of God; such a readiness is an obliquity in his will, and a moral evil, and therefore God is not obliged to prevent the execution of it, for that were to prevent the punishment, though the guilt be contracted; and it is easy to see what the consequence of such a procedure may be in a world that is to be governed by rewards and punishments, and what effect it might have on those innumerable myriads of intelligent beings that are under the government of God, and that are all now virtuous by their choice, and thereby justly distinguished in their rewards and circumstances, and possessed of that most valuable perfection and only moral good, an active conformity to the will of God. Whereas, if the will of man were necessitated and held by an irresistible force from choosing amiss, the whole intellectual creation would be let loose, and under no kind of moral obligation to concern themselves about their choices, and so there could only be a passive conformity to God's will, and no room for virtue or holiness, which are the most valuable goods in the world; and hence to avoid some moral evil there would be no room left for any moral good."*

There are many who recklessly rush to the conclusion that, because God did not prevent sin, therefore he must have desired it, and purposed its existence. A moment's reflection, however, is all that is necessary to see that there is a great difference between non-intervention on the part of God to prevent the existence of sin, and his positively purposing or decreeing its existence, and disposing all the means there-

*See *King on the Origin of Evil*; page 406.

unto. The fact of his non-intervention to prevent the free volition of free agents, is evident from the actual existence of sin; and the fact that he never desired it, or decreed it, is no less evident from its nature, for sin is a transgression of the law of God; and he could not either be pleased with, or purpose, or plan, what is opposed to his holy law, or his own nature. The thing is in the nature of things impossible.

Just one other thought before closing this article on the doctrine of causes. God not only resolved, in his own infinite mind, to bring a moral system into being, though he foresaw that at least two provinces of his vast empire would raise the puny arm of rebellion against his righteous authority, but he saw that he could overrule that very evil for the ultimate good of the great universe of which he was the governor. He saw, or foresaw, that he could take advantage of the evil which had its origin with the governed, or the subject, and not with the sovereign, for the display and exhibition of his own moral perfections, and ultimately overrule that very evil for the permanent and everlasting good of all holy beings in all worlds.

God is infinitely wise, and infinitely good: let us never forget this. Let us also remember that he both can, and frequently does, bring good out of evil. O, it would be a pity if he who sitteth upon the throne of glory, and who holds in his hands the reins of government, could not overrule evil for good! O, it would be a pity if that God before whom the highest and the holiest created intelligences wonder and adore, could not overrule for good the self-originated evil thoughts and wicked actions of a few lawless subjects in some insignificant province of his vast domain! O, it would be a pity if the mighty monarch of the universe, who rules and reigns in righteousness, with all his knowledge, benevolence, and manifest wisdom, could be outwitted by a few lawless pests and prodigals, who have torn themselves away from allegiance to his throne! But this cannot be. He can, and will, cause even the wrath of men to praise him.

I think I have clearly shown that we are not the slaves of necessity; that we are powers, first causes of effects. We have seen that we can sin, for we can obey God; and

that we can obey God, for we can sin. In one word, we have seen that the mind of every moral agent, *as a moral agent*, and *because* he is a moral agent, originates thought at the bidding of the mind, and we, as intelligent beings, are conscious that we give being to volitions, which volitions terminate in outward actions, outward actions, too, let it be noticed, for which we, and *we only*, are praise-worthy or blame-worthy, as the case may be, because we are the first causes of effects *in our sphere of action*, as truly as our Creator and moral Governor is *in his sphere of action*.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

It is with much pleasure that we announce to our readers the appearance, in this number of the quarterly, of the first of a series of sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian educational history, in connection with Dr. Lindsley's "Sources and Sketches." The venerable and learned Professor of Systematic Theology in Cumberland University gives us a remarkable and valuable contribution to our educational annals, in a "Brief Historical Sketch of Cumberland College." Having been so long connected with that institution, the eldest of our schools for advanced education of the ministry, Dr. Beard is pre-eminently qualified to record its great work, and we are assured that the Church will be gratified at the presentation which he makes of it.

We have hope that Waynesburg College, Cumberland University, McGee College, Lincoln University, Trinity University, Cane Hill College, and possibly other institutions, will be presented to the Church in faithful sketches of their splendid services in the cause of education. Dr. Beard's article has been stereotyped, and the plates laid away for other

articles of the series, which are to be stereotyped in succession, until the last one is ready to be placed on the press with the others, and a volume of educational history produced of which our Church will be justly proud. May we not reasonably expect our ministers and other reading members of the Church, to appreciate these valuable papers, and enable us to present them to the public in the pages of the MEDIUM? How? do you say? We answer, by giving the quarterly a better support. Brethren, do not allow your noble exponent of theological thought to die for the want of a little earnest work on your part. This number is replete with interest.

NOTE.—Rev. H. D. Onyett, author of the excellent article in the January number of the MEDIUM, on “Why Did God Permit Sin?” calls attention to the following errors in the article as printed: On page 103 of the number, “The fundamental error,” should be “This fundamental error”; page 105, “Jesus Christ is not the remedy of sin,” should be “Jesus Christ is not the minister of sin”; “remedy” should be in place of “ministry,” in the line above the one where it occurs; page 106, “This sin,” etc., should be “his sin,” etc. Our copy-holder begs pardon.

BOOK NOTICES.

(Two very excellent notices of books have been placed in our hands, and we give them place, as may be seen below.—
ED. THEO. MEDIUM.)

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION: AN INQUIRY INTO THE REALITY OF DIVINE REVELATION, IN TWO VOLUMES. FIFTH EDITION. LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co. BOSTON: ROBERTS BROS. 1875.

Having read these two volumes of about five hundred pages each, with some degree of attention and interest, and not having seen them noticed in any of our Church publications, I feel disposed to express my views of the work, and the impression which it has produced on my mind. Our author does not give us his name, but in the two large volumes before us, he gives us a very full revelation of his own mind, with respect to *Divine Revelation*. He has no faith whatever in a divine revelation, and all his reasoning, his learning, his investigations, and criticisms, are brought to bear upon the minds of his readers, in order to convince them that a supernatural or divine revelation is *quite unnecessary and absurd*. He tells us very plainly that “The necessity of divine revelation is a pure theological figment opposed to reason.” Our author devotes about two hundred pages of the first volume to the subject of miracles. The remaining three hundred pages, and fully one-half of the second volume, are devoted to a critical investigation of the synoptic gospels. Part third, or the second half of the second volume, he devotes to an examination of the fourth gospel. His great object is, to prove that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, did not write the four gospels; that they were written long after these men were dead, and that everything supernatural, and miraculous recorded in the New Testament is utterly unworthy of credit, because it never occurred, and never could occur. A supernatural revelation from the divine Being is an impossibility and absurd. This is the alpha and the omega of the two volumes, and the writer feels quite sure, from beginning to

end, that no intelligent reader can resist his reasoning, or refute his arguments.

My own impression is, that this bold attack upon revealed religion in general, and the heavenly origin of the four gospels in particular, is an utter failure; and I have only been confirmed in my conviction that the Bible is the Book of God. Just think of it: a man writes two volumes to prove that God cannot write one! It was reasonable and right, and it would seem necessary, that our author should give us a very full revelation of his mind on the subject of religion, in order to convince us that God cannot give us a revelation of his mind on the same subject. Surely we live in an age of miracles. What next?

It would take me very far beyond the limits of this short notice, to enter into a review of the work before me; a very few extracts will show its spirit and object. In reference to miracles, the author says: "Known laws refuse to recognize such astounding statements as those affirming the resurrection of an absolutely dead man, a bodily ascension, or the miraculous multiplication of loaves and fishes." (Vol. I., page 36.) The very idea of a miracle, he tells us, has its foundation in ignorance and vulgar superstition; and that no number of eye-witnesses, however honest and truthful they might be, could have the slightest influence in carrying conviction to his mind. In speaking of the raising of Lazarus from the grave, he tells us very plainly that the thing never was done. The account of it in the fourth gospel "is a mere imaginary scene, illustrative of the dogma, 'I am the resurrection and the life,' upon which it is based. This conclusion is confirmed by the peculiarities of the narrative itself." (Vol. II., page 460.) In speaking of the sympathy of Jesus, and his weeping at the grave with the two sisters who had buried their brother, our author says: "There is so total an absence of reason for such grief, that these tears, to any sober reader, are seen to be the theatrical adjunets of a dramatic scene elaborated out of the imagination of the writer" (page 461). Indeed, he asserts that none of the gospels "lays claim to any special inspiration, or, in the slightest degree, pretends to be more than a human composition, and subject to the errors

of human history." (Vol. I., page 152.) Hear him again. He says: "Apart from continual minor considerations throughout all of these narratives, it is impossible to reconcile the markedly different representations of the fourth and of the synoptic gospels. They mutually destroy each other as evidences. These gospels themselves do not pretend to be inspired histories, and they cannot, upon any ground, be regarded as more than mere human compositions. As evidence for miracles, and the reality of divine revelation, they have no weight, being merely narratives, written long after the events recorded, by unknown persons, who were neither eye-witnesses of the supposed miraculous occurrences, nor hearers of the statements they profess to report." (Vol. II., page 481.)

Our author professes, like Renan, to have a profound respect for Jesus; but, strange to say, has, like the French skeptic, no faith in him as a supernatural person, no faith in his divinity, or in his resurrection from the dead. Indeed, he assumes at the very outset, that a divine revelation is an absurdity, and has its foundation in superstition. So that, according to our author, Jesus never did, and never could, perform a miracle; there was nothing in him, nor done by him, that was at all supernatural. Hence we have the following as proof: "Morality was the essence of his system; theology was an afterthought. It is to the followers of Jesus, and not to the Master himself, that we owe the supernatural elements so characteristic of the age and people." (Vol. II., page 486.) He then proceeds in the closing pages to speak, in his own way, very highly of the life and character of Christ, and Christianity; and yet, strange to say, he tells us that Christianity can afford to abandon all claims to a supernatural character! On page 489 he says; "In surrendering its miraculous element, and its claims to supernatural origin, therefore, the religion of Jesus does not lose its virtue, or the qualities which have made it a blessing to humanity." He tells us that there is no truth in supernatural religion; that divine revelation is just another name for human superstition; that the supernatural outrages reason and moral sense; that it is the wildest delusion, and, would you believe it, he,

after using scores and hundreds of expressions to the same effect, tells us that "We gain infinitely more than we lose in abandoning belief in the reality of divine revelation. While we retain pure and unimpaired the light of Christian morality, we relinquish nothing but the debasing elements added to it by human superstition" (page 489). Which just means this, in substance, if it means anything: We should extinguish the sun in the heavens, and we shall gain a very great deal by doing so; *provided we at the same time walk in the light which comes from it.*

Just listen to him once more; he says on the very next page: "Let no man whose belief in the reality of divine revelation may be destroyed by such inquiry, complain that he has lost a precious possession, and that nothing is left but a blank. The revelation not being a reality, that which he has lost was but an illusion, and that which is left is the truth. If he be content with illusions, he will speedily be consoled; if he be a lover only of truth, instead of a blank, he will recognize that the reality before him is full of great peace."

Comment here is unnecessary.

I would say, just in closing, that after having carefully read the two volumes, I feel more and more satisfied that revealed religion is a reality, a grand fact, and no cunningly devised fable. Also, that the principle, if not the only, arguments which I have discovered in the volumes before me, against the heavenly origin of the four gospels, are apparent discrepancies, Christian errors, the writer's own false interpretations, sweeping assertions, and assumptions without proof.

HENRY MELVILLE.

WESTERN CAVALIERS: Embracing the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in Kentucky, from 1832 to 1844.
By A. H. Redford, D.D.

We have read this volume with great pleasure. It is a neat duodecimo, well brought out as it respects manufacture, and filled with varied and interesting matter. Did time permit, this notice could readily be expanded into a long article. Suffice it to say, that the work is really a continuation of Dr. Redford's well-known "History of Methodism in Kentucky," in three similar volumes. Thus he has given a full, exact,

and reliable account of that branch of the Church, from its origin in Kentucky, until a comparatively recent period. By experts in his own Church, Dr. Redford's historical labors have met with universal commendation.

We have been specially impressed by three points in our study of the volume: First, the bold, emphatic, advanced ground all along taken by the Kentucky Methodists in favor of the temperance cause. Notwithstanding that the manufacture of alcoholic liquors is a leading industrial pursuit in that State, they have ever been clear and pronounced for total abstinence, and against the liquor traffic, root and branch. God bless the Kentucky Methodists in this good work. May they still adhere to the principles and practice of their noble fathers, as recorded in this volume.

Second, The lively interest manifested in the cause of African colonization, as connected with the welfare of the colored people in this country, and with the Christian regeneration of the great peninsular continent. Time and again were devoted members of Conference detailed to act as agents for this cause. Query, Why should not all our Protestant evangelical Churches devote to this cause and to these people, the same thought and attention as formerly?

Third, The warm, emphatic, and conclusive vindication of John Newland Maffitt, the celebrated revivalist. The ordinary impression of this famous man is, that he was a great genius, very erratic, and of enigmatical standing in his own denomination. Dr. Redford, who personally knew him intimately, and was an eyewitness of much of his work, proves that he was a man of genuine piety and zeal, whose brilliant labors and wonderful successes in the Lord's vineyard brought upon him the malice, hatred, and calumnies of those who love darkness, because their deeds are evil. Herein Dr. Redford has done a good work, and he has done it well.

In looking at the seven beautiful volumes in which McFerrin and Redford have registered a portion of the history of the Methodist Church in two States; and also at the great works of Bangs and Stevens, giving a general history of the denomination in the United States; and again at the many special histories of different sections and periods, we are forcibly struck with the great attention paid by the Methodists to their

Church history. Herein they show their usual practical wisdom. For history *is* philosophy teaching by example. These many, well-written, exciting narratives do, beyond question, exert a powerful educating influence upon the entire vast body of that denomination. Ministers and laity are aroused, stimulated, encouraged to work as opportunity offers, and to emulate the faith and deeds of their fathers.

J. B. LINDSLEY.

HISTORY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH. By A. H. Redford, D.D. Nashville, Tenn.: Published by A. H. Redford, Agent for the M. E. Church, South. 1875.

The present is a new edition of this work, which was first brought out in 1871. It is a book of 660 pages, duodecimo, well printed and on good paper. The book contains the speeches, papers, and various official documents connected with the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, from the antecedent steps in the General Conference of 1844, which led to the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church into two bodies, to the close of what we may call the period of agitation. The purpose of the author is to set forth the "organization," not the subsequent history of the Church, whose interests he strives ably to promote. The showing here given is a strong one, and any person who wishes to be conversant with the great ecclesiastical facts of our country's history, will do well to read this work. Considering the great responsibilities and labors which must devolve upon Dr. Redford, as Agent of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in its publishing department, it seems wonderful that he finds any time to prepare and publish books—two of his productions being noticed here together. Such energy is truly commendable, and stands forth as strikingly exemplary for all young men.

THE DISRUPTION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 1844-1846: Comprising a Thirty Years' History of the Relations of the two Methodisms. By Edward H. Myers, D.D. With an introduction by T. O. Summers, D.D. Nashville, Tenn.: A. H. Redford, Agent. Macon, Ga.: J. W. Burke and Company. 1875.

This is a new work on the subject discussed in the book

just previously noticed. It is a duodecimo of 216 pages, more closely printed than the former, and presenting the subject from the standpoint of more recent events. The author says of it in his preface: "It is, necessarily, both historical and polemic. As a history, it narrates the events of 1844; giving the partition between two jurisdictions of the ministry and members of the one original Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States; the principles occasioning the rupture maintained by the antagonistic parties; the relations the two Churches have since held toward each other; and their attitude now that tentative efforts toward reconciliation have been inaugurated."

Without doubt, there are vigor and earnestness in the presentation made in this book, of the subject as viewed by a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Our examination of the work leads us to say, sorrowfully, that the hope of union between the two bodies here considered, on some plan "which *both Churches will esteem altogether honorable*," is exceedingly feeble at present.

CYCLOPEDIA OF BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE. Prepared by the Rev. John McClintock, D.D., and James Strong, S.T.D. Vol. VI.—ME-NEV. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1876.

Just in time for notice in this number of our quarterly, which has been somewhat delayed, this work is none the less appreciated and to be commended. Through the courtesy of Prof. J. H. Worman, of Lawrence University, Wisconsin, who has done so much to render this grand product of learning, industry, taste, and skill what it is in its colossal proportions, we received in the fall of 1873, and noticed, with much pleasure, the first five volumes, in the October number of the THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM of that year. More than two years have elapsed since the fifth volume of the work appeared, and yet the delay will be found to be a gain, in the fact that Dr. Strong, the editor, has spent a great part of the time in Europe and the East, gathering stores of honeyed learning, to be deposited and preserved for the use of many in the grand volume before us, and in the others yet to come before the public eye.

This volume, which Harper & Brothers have placed upon our table, contain nine hundred and ninety-seven pages, royal octavo, of which the last five comprise a list of the articles of which it is composed, in the order of their arrangement, with the pages; that is, a condensed index of subjects, by which a given subject can be quickly found. There are more than one hundred and fifty illustrations by cuts of manifold sizes, many of which are clear, beautiful, and impressive pictures. The impression of the type is distinct, and the page clear and bright. Forty-seven writers, of whom some are among the leading men of learning in America and Europe, contribute articles to the composition of the volume, and a great variety of interesting, instructive, and most useful information is imparted. The historical contributions alone are of exceeding importance, and they contain much, in a condensed form, which every intelligent person will wish to have in possession, and convenient for references on many occasions. To ministers of the gospel this Cyclopaedia is of inestimable value, because on all possible subjects of investigation it offers a perfect fund of knowledge. As the volume is upon topics ranging from the letters ME to NEV, we can illustrate by calling attention to the accounts, given by capable pens, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Methodist Protestant Church, and others. These articles are full of instruction in their line, and by such men as Dr. D. A. Whedon, Dr. T. O. Summers, etc. But a still more valuable production is the one on Missions, by Dr. D. P. Kidder, professor in Drew Theological Seminary, because it extends over thirty-eight of these grand pages, and presents a vast array of facts and tabulated statements of missionary societies, their operations, successes, localities, home and foreign fields of work, receipts and present outlook.

We must close this notice, and we do so by saying that the amount and variety of learning, not merely as indicated in the descriptive terms, "biblical, theological, and ecclesiastical" on the title page, but as seen in manifold discussions of all manner of subjects throughout the work, commend it without limit to all intelligent persons in all classes of society and in all vocations of life.

A TREATISE ON THE PREPARATION AND DELIVERY OF SERMONS. By John A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S. C. Sixth Edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 710 Arch Street. New York: Sheldon & Co., 500 Broadway. Richmond, Va.: Starke & Ryland. 1875.

The excellent booksellers, Hunter & Warren, of this city, have placed this well-known and often noticed book upon our table, which they will sell at \$2.00, with a liberal discount to ministers. Although this work has been frequently brought to the attention of ministers and others, we are pleased to do so again, and particularly as we have never given it such a notice, and as it so well deserves it. We have never thought very much of elocutionary drill, for theological students, when it takes that form which leads some young men to practice before the glass, to see whether their gestures are graceful and well made, in connection with their words; but we have ever enjoyed seeing a preacher put his heart into his subject and manner when preaching, and thus allow nature and the Spirit of God to speak through him to the hearts of men, and women, and children. Two grand points are presented by the title of this book: first, preparation of sermons; second, delivery of sermons. Upon both these, the common sense of the author of this work has commended it to a very large number of judicious men in all Churches. We have no room here to illustrate by extracts from the book, but suffice it to say that upon "preparation" of sermons, there is a clear and ample presentation of the subject which can only be appreciated by a careful perusal of the book. One thing the author brings out with cumulative force; that is, the necessity of thorough preparation for the pulpit. Upon the "delivery" of sermons, very many excellent reflections are made, and he gives the decided approval of his judgment to what is called extemporaneous speaking, meaning by that, not speaking without having prepared for the occasion, but after thorough preparation of the sermon, delivering it without having written it, and from a full heart as well as mind, depending for proper language upon the inspiration of the moment, and the power of habit.

On the whole subject of "delivery," as including preparation, the author has the following finely expressed passage, with which we close this notice: "Have something to say which you are confident is worth saying; scarcely anything will contribute so much as this confidence, to give dignity, directness, ease and power to delivery. Have the treatment well arranged, not after the fashion of an essay, but with the orderly and rapid movement proper to a discourse. Be thoroughly familiar with all that you propose to say, so that you may feel no uneasiness; for the dread of failure sadly interrupts the flow of thought and feeling. Think it all over within a short time of the hour for speaking, so that you may be sure of the ground, and so that your feelings may be brought into lively sympathy with the subject; it is, however, best, *immediately* before speaking to have the mind free from active thought, maintaining only a quiet, devotional frame. Let the physical condition be as vigorous as possible. In order to this, seek good health in general; take abundant sleep the night before speaking; at the meal before speaking eat moderately, of food easily digested, and if you are to speak immediately, eat very little; and do not, if it can possibly be avoided, exhaust your vitality during the day by exciting conversation. A healthy condition of the *nervous system* is surpassingly important; not a morbid excitability, such as is produced by studying very late the night before, but a healthy condition, so that feeling may quickly respond to thought, so that there may be sympathetic emotion, and at the same time complete self-control.

Above all, be yourself. Speak out with freedom and earnestness what you think and feel. Better a thousand faults, than through dread of faults to be *tame*. Some of the most useful preachers, men in a true and high sense eloquent, have had grave defects of manner. Habitually correct faults as far as possible, but whether the voice and action be good or bad, if there is something in you to say, speak it out."